

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 30, 1923.

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1923.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FIXING PRESIDENTIAL TERMS, ETC.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to call attention to something that happened yesterday in the Senate when I was not in the Chamber; and I want to call attention to what I believe was an error and perhaps make an explanation in regard to it.

I was not here yesterday when the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] was talking upon some pending motion to refer a bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think that was the motion. He was interrupted by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], who called the attention of the Senate to a condition relating to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is now on the calendar. I want to read just a little from the RECORD as to what the Senator from Minnesota said. He said:

A moment ago the Senator from Connecticut referred to a joint resolution proposing a certain amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which joint resolution had been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

I have not read the part of the RECORD in which the Senator from Connecticut made that reference. However, if he made the same mistake the Senator from Minnesota has made, I shall be able to correct that wrongful impression.

I desire—

Said the Senator from Minnesota—

to make a brief statement in reference to that matter.

The joint resolution proposed an amendment of the Constitution to dispense with the presidential electors and to provide for a direct vote of the people for President.

He was referring then to a joint resolution reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He proceeded:

At the last session of Congress the Senator from Nebraska introduced a similar joint resolution contemplating such an amendment, and accompanied it with a statement on the floor. At his suggestion that joint resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee, of which he is a member, and, on his own request, I appointed him chairman of a subcommittee to consider the joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment. That joint resolution is still pending before the Judiciary Committee and is still in the hands of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Nebraska is chairman.

Mr. President, with the exception of my asking the Senator to appoint me as chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota stated the matter correctly. I did introduce such a joint resolution at the last regular session of Congress. I accompanied it with a short statement at the time I introduced it. I asked that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. At the next meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary I asked that the joint resolution be referred to a subcommittee. The chairman of the committee very courteously appointed me as chairman of the subcommittee. So, with that simple correction, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stated the matter correctly.

I realize, as I think every Senator does, that a Senator who is chairman of one of the great committees of the Senate has practically no time to devote to committee work on committees of which he is not chairman. I have found that with the work of the Agricultural Committee, much of which of course the Senate never considers because it does not get here, my time is entirely taken up; in fact, I could devote, if I had it, twice the time I do devote to that committee. I have tried to perform properly my duties as chairman of that committee.

Mr. President, personally I would be glad to be relieved from that arduous duty because there are so many details and so much work that takes time, not only of the Senator but of the force in his office, that he does not have an opportunity or time to consider other matters in which he is greatly interested. I myself suggested, when the committees of the present Congress were selected by the committee on committees, that I thought Senators like myself, who are chairmen of great committees, ought not to be put on any other committee, and I was perfectly willing that the rule should apply to me if it likewise applied to every other chairman. I would be glad to see that course followed now. I think it ought to be done.

But, Mr. President, I was deeply interested in the joint resolution. Notwithstanding the fact that my time was so taken up, I tried my very best to get a meeting of the subcommittee and to get action on the joint resolution. I have never been able even to get a meeting of the subcommittee. I

have called a meeting at various times, but not during this session, because I gave it up last session. I say that without any criticism of the members of the subcommittee. They were likewise busy on other things. One of them at least was chairman of another subcommittee which was having hearings.

It was a physical impossibility to get consideration of the joint resolution. Whatever blame attaches to me I gladly accept and assume full responsibility. However, the next part of the statement of the Senator from Minnesota is erroneous, as I think I shall be able to show, and if anyone questions it I think I can demonstrate it from the RECORD.

At this session of Congress—

Said the Senator from Minnesota—

the Senator from Nebraska introduced another joint resolution having in view the same object.

That is erroneous. I did not do it.

It was done at a time when I was not present in the Senate.

That is the reason why the Senator was mistaken. If he had been present and had remembered it he would realize that I did not introduce the joint resolution.

At all events, it escaped my attention. The Senator from Nebraska had that joint resolution proposing the same constitutional amendment referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—

That is erroneous. It was not the same kind of a resolution. It was not introduced by me and I had nothing whatever to do with the reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture. But the Senator went on to say—

and from that committee he succeeded in securing a report on the joint resolution.

I did succeed in getting a report from the Committee on Agriculture.

I have been patiently waiting for him, as chairman of the subcommittee, to submit a report to the full Judiciary Committee on the joint resolution which he introduced and had referred to that committee, and which is still pending there.

I am finding no fault whatever with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I think he did his full duty. He did it promptly. Under no circumstances have I ever in the slightest degree indicated, even indirectly, any criticism. I am as much to blame as anybody, and the reason why I am to blame for the delay in reporting that joint resolution of mine from the Judiciary Committee is the reason I have already stated. Be it good or bad, those are the facts.

But, Mr. President, the resolution which was reported by me from the Committee on Agriculture, while it did provide for an amendment to the Constitution, was a committee resolution. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] one day introduced a concurrent resolution in the Senate. It had reference to Members of Congress who had been defeated at the recent election and who were then and are now participating in general legislation. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. It had reference to the meeting of the old Congress after the new one had been elected by the people. I was present when that reference was made. It was not done covertly. The Chair stated it fairly, and he made the reference after he had made a statement of the request of the Senator from Arkansas. I did not have anything to do with the preparation of the concurrent resolution. I had no knowledge that it was going to be introduced. It was referred, I think, as a joke to the Committee on Agriculture. There was a smile in the Senate that such a resolution should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. But it was so referred, and it was not referred at my request. No such request was made by me. It was the action of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas plainly in the open Senate made the request. The Chair asked if there was any objection and there was none.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator will also recall that I called attention to the fact that the jurisdiction was properly with the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NORRIS. I remember it distinctly.

Mr. CARAWAY. So that no one was deceived.

Mr. NORRIS. No one was deceived, but everybody laughed when it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The long-whiskered farmers on the Committee on Agriculture took the matter seriously. We went to work on it. We thought that the resolution introduced by the Senator from Arkansas did not provide a remedy for the evil to which he called attention in the whereases, that there had been an election and a new Congress elected but the old Congress was still doing business. He also called attention to some legislation to which it referred. I do not know whether he called attention to it or not, but it was a fact that the resolution in effect was passed by some organization and it was then introduced by him.

Now, the Committee on Agriculture took it up seriously. I was directed by the Committee on Agriculture to report a substitute resolution which would, we thought, meet the difficulty and which required a constitutional amendment in order to accomplish it. I drafted the joint resolution. It had two parts to it, one pertaining to the presidential electors and the other having reference to the fixing of the beginning of a term of Congress which in effect would do away with the short session of Congress and would provide for the meeting on the first Monday in January of the new Congress elected in November. After I had prepared the joint resolution, at a subsequent meeting of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, I read it. It was again referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and I was directed by a unanimous vote of that committee to report it to the Senate.

Mr. President, that is the history of the joint resolution. If we had followed the ordinary procedure the resolution would not have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. At the time I did not wish to have it referred to that committee; I myself had an impulse to object, but it seemed to me that, being the chairman of the committee, an objection would probably not come with good grace from me. So I remained silent, and the committee assumed the burden which the Senate put upon it. We have discharged our duty as best we knew how. Those are the facts with reference to the joint resolution which is now on the calendar.

Mr. President, I wish to say, as I have once before said, that I contemplate making a motion to take up the joint resolution before this session of Congress shall have expired, as soon as we shall have disposed of the so-called rural credits bill, which is now pending.

I thought I ought to say this much now, because the Senator from Connecticut as well as the Senator from Minnesota was laboring under a misapprehension as to the joint resolution. I make the statement in justice to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which did not seek this responsibility. It was put upon them by the Senate itself, and having been placed there, we have undertaken to perform our duty as we understood it. I may add that at the time the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who himself is a member of the Judiciary Committee, was in the chair.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Gooding | McCormick | Shortridge |
| Brookhart | Hale | McCumber | Smith |
| Bursum | Harris | McKellar | Smoot |
| Cameron | Harrison | McLean | Spencer |
| Capper | Hefflin | McNary | Stanfield |
| Caraway | Hitchcock | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Colt | Johnson | New | Townsend |
| Couzens | Jones, Wash. | Nicholson | Trammell |
| Culberson | Kellogg | Norbeck | Underwood |
| Curtis | Kendrick | Norris | Wadsworth |
| Ernst | King | Oddie | Walsh, Mass. |
| Fletcher | Ladd | Overman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Frelinghuysen | La Follette | Page | Warren |
| George | Lenroot | Ransdell | Watson |
| Glass | Lodge | Reed, Pa. | Williams |

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is detained at home on account of sickness. I ask that this notice may stand for the day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] are detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] are absent on the business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in partial response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, reporting relative to the number and cost of maintenance of passenger-carrying automobiles in use by the War Department in the city of Washington, which was ordered to lie on the table.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LAND.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the withdrawals

and restorations of public lands during the period beginning December 1, 1921, and ending November 21, 1922, and also the areas embraced in outstanding withdrawals at the latter date, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the final annual report of the company for the year 1922, to be substituted for the report heretofore submitted in which the results of the operations of the company for the month of December were only estimated, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ODDIE, Mr. GERRY, and Mr. SWANSON as members of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate to visit the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916.

PETITIONS.

Mr. LADD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gladstone, Chaseley, and Enderlin, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the passage of legislation extending immediate aid to the famine-stricken peoples of the German and Austrian Republics, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BAKER RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON.

Mr. McNARY presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Senate joint memorial.

To the Hon. A. P. DAVIS,
Director of the United States Reclamation Service.

We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives concurring, respectfully represent: That

"Whereas the United States Reclamation Service has made an exhaustive examination and survey of what is known as the Baker project, located in Baker County in this State; and

"Whereas estimates are about to be submitted covering the feasibility and cost of said project; and

"Whereas an examination of the soil and climatic conditions has been made by Prof. W. L. Powers, soil expert of the Oregon Agricultural College, and that the report is that the soil conditions and climatic conditions are wholly satisfactory and the soil of more than average fertility, and that the conditions are extremely favorable for the building of a successful project and providing homes for a large number of people and bringing under cultivation a large acreage of land and resulting in a large increase of population and wealth in the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon has paid into the reclamation fund from the sale of public lands a large sum of money, and the sum of money paid into said fund is greatly in excess of the sum of money received therefrom; and

"Whereas the said Baker project, tentatively adopted by the Reclamation Service, is the only new project in the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas the said project will come before the said Director of the United States Reclamation Service for final approval; and

"Whereas the said project, on account of its proximity to the national forest furnishing cheap lumber for improvements, its close proximity to active markets, its soil and climatic conditions, can stand a high cost per acre for building; and

"Whereas the building of the said project will be an important factor in the encouragement of irrigation in the State of Oregon and stimulating the reclamation of thousands of acres of the arid lands of said State: Now therefore we, your memorialists, do hereby

"Resolve, That the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives concurring, favor the building of the said Baker project and do hereby urge that the said project have favorable consideration at your hands and do urge upon you that you finally approve the building of the said project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the Hon. A. P. Davis, Director of the United States Reclamation Service, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress."

Concurred in by the House January 19, 1923.

K. K. KUBIE,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the Senate January 18, 1923.

JAY UPTON,
President of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4425) to authorize appropriations for the relief of certain officers of the Army of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1071) thereon.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back the bill (S. 4362) to provide aid from the United States for the several States in prevention and control of drug addiction and the care and treatment of drug addicts, and for other purposes, and ask that the committee be discharged from its further consideration. I suggest that the bill should go to

the Committee on Finance, as that committee has charge of the subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Appropriations will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 4119) authorizing the erection in the city of Washington of a monument in memory of the faithful colored mammies of the South, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1072) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4061) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with Toole County irrigation district, of Shelby, Mont., and the Cut Bank irrigation district, of Cut Bank, Mont., for the settlement of the extent of the priority to the waters of Two Medicine, Cut Bank, and Badger Creeks of the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1073) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10211) authorizing an appropriation to meet proportionate expenses of providing a drainage system for Piute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the Newlands reclamation project of the Reclamation Service, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1074) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4404) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to trustees to be named by the Chamber of Commerce of Columbia, S. C., certain lands at Camp Jackson, S. C., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1075) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4440) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 4441) granting a pension to Millie Newman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 4442) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4443) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Hunt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4444) granting a pension to Thomas J. Boice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 4445) to amend the first paragraph of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4446) granting a pension to Oscar E. Burrow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. NORBECK submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to amend the Federal farm loan act, to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS OF WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of War to permit, without cost to the United States, the erection of monuments or memorials in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park to commemorate encampments of Spanish War organizations which were encamped in said park during the period of the Spanish-American War, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the mileage allowance to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when called into active service for training for 15 days or less shall not

exceed 4 cents per mile, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for activities of the national board for promotion of rifle practice, quartermaster supplies, and services for rifle ranges for civilian instruction, etc., from \$20,000 to \$89,900, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that the master of the sword at the Military Academy, upon the completion of his service, shall be entitled to be placed upon the retired list of the Army (with the rank of lieutenant colonel) under the same conditions as are prescribed by law for other officers of the Army, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that no part of the appropriations made in the act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that hereafter the cost of transportation of civilian employees and of material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Signal Corps, Air Service, Medical Department, Ordnance Department, Engineer Department, and the Coast Artillery Corps, and in connection with the construction and installation of fire-control projects at seacoast fortifications by the Coast Artillery Corps, may be charged to the appropriations for the work in connection with which such transportation charges are required, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. BORAH. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 426) was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is authorized and requested to invite such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such adjustments or settlement as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions; and also to consider the subject of further limitation of armaments with a view of reaching an understanding or agreement upon said matter, both by land and by sea, and particularly relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. CALDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 427), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Senate Resolution 444, agreed to March 3, 1921, authorizing the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to continue the employment of an assistant clerk, payable out of the contingent fund, until the end of the present Congress, be, and the same hereby is, further continued in full force and effect until the end of the Sixty-eighth Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 428), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-seventh Congress, to send for persons, book and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 472) for the relief of William B. Lancaster, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

WILLIAM B. LANCASTER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 472) for the relief of William B. Lancaster, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William B. Lancaster, during his natural life, the sum of \$40 per month, to date from the passage of this act, as compensation for injuries sustained while employed by the Reclamation Service at the west portal, Strawberry Tunnel, Strawberry Valley project, Utah, said monthly payments to be paid through the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I called up for consideration the conference report on the annual Agricultural appropriation bill and made a formal motion with respect to certain amendments. At the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] I consented that the matter might go over until to-day. By way of a parliamentary inquiry I desire to know if it is necessary to renew my motion, or is it carried over to this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may ask unanimous consent to take the report from the table, and then the motion heretofore made by him will be pending.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the conference committee on the annual Agricultural appropriation bill may be taken from the table.

There being no objection, the Vice President laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13481, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the motion of the Senator from Oregon which is now pending.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] moved that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 31, 33, and 35, and that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 34.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if the conference report represents a full agreement on the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. McNARY. It does.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not had time to go over the report in detail and I should like to ask the Senator what was done with some of the Senate amendments, notably the one making an appropriation for the investigation of insects prevalent in my section of the country affecting the sweet potato?

Mr. McNARY. That item as passed by the Senate is found on page 51 of the bill and reads:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products, \$173,000.

The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$123,000 for this item; the House appropriated \$123,000; the Senate committee recommended \$123,000, but on the floor of the Senate the appropriation was increased \$50,000 under the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi. That brought the total to \$173,000. The Senate conferees, however, after discussing the matter at length with the House conferees, yielded to the House conferees and the item stands now at \$123,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very sorry to hear that; it will be very bad news to those who are interested in the cultivation of sweet potatoes.

I should like to ask the Senator also what was done with respect to the provision for market news wire service?

Mr. McNARY. That provision was left in the bill as the Senate passed it, appropriating \$700,000 to provide for the distribution annually by wire of market news. Under the appropriation the service may be provided for the Pacific coast and the Southeastern States bordering on the Gulf and the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. HARRISON. Were any other of the amounts reduced in conference where the appropriations were increased on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator that by amendment numbered 4 in the item which provides for collecting data concerning frost damage, the Senate inserted a provision with regard to spraying, and that was eliminated by the conferees; so the item remains the same as it came over from the House.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, I do not want to pry into any of the secrets of the conference; but I suppose it was contended by the conferees representing the House that the sweet-potato item was eliminated because the Bureau of the Budget had not recommended it?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator that that was not the sole consideration. Of course, it is always an element in the discussion of such a matter and arriving at a solution of the problem. I think the House conferees did mention that fact, but we thought the amount appropriated under this item as it reads now was sufficient to do this work.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the Senator made every effort to carry out the wishes of the Senate as expressed by the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. McNARY. Oh, I can say to the Senator that I never worked harder in my life.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure of that.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the next item is concerning barberry eradication. The House appropriated \$350,000 for this purpose. The Senate increased the House appropriation to \$500,000 on the floor. The conferees agreed upon \$425,000 for this purpose, making \$125,000 available for cooperative work, in the hope that those States and communities where the infestation occurs will more actively cooperate with the Government in the control and eradication of the barberry.

The next item is the sweet-potato item, to which I have called attention.

The next item is the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], where he made a reservation that \$150,000 of the money appropriated to extinguish predatory animals should go to California. The Senate conferees yielded on that provision.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senate conferees yielded? Is that important item now stricken from the bill?

Mr. McNARY. The item is not so important as the Senator from Mississippi might think when he reads it.

Mr. HARRISON. I heard the very eloquent speech of the junior Senator from California, and he led me to believe that it was very important.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. KING. Before leaving that item, may I inquire whether the amount carried in the bill as it left the Senate was reduced, or did the conferees merely strike out the language which required a certain amount of the appropriation to be expended solely in the State of California?

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Utah that the amount was not increased or decreased. It remained the same; but the provision which provided for the expenditure of \$150,000 in California was stricken from the bill, so that the language of the bill is general in its nature, and no part of it is confined to any one particular State.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to know that, because the provision, may I say to the Senator, with the indulgence of the Senator from Mississippi, seemed to me to be very unfair and discriminatory. If funds which are appropriated for a section are to be segregated in the bill, and one State is to receive a given quantity, then obviously the other States would be deprived of their proportionate share, and it would lead ultimately to a complete division of the fund in the appropriation bill, leading to wild scrambles between sections, and would divorce the authority expending it from any discretion or any power in the matter. I congratulate the Senator on having eliminated that very unwise and, I was about to say, indefensible provision.

Mr. HARRISON. Evidently the Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber when the junior Senator from California presented the amendment and discussed it or he might have changed the opinion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. That may be. The Senator from California has great influence with the Senator from Utah; but I am inclined to think that in this matter his eloquence would have been in vain.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from California is temporarily out of the Chamber. I have sent for him so that he can again elaborate upon this subject if he desires.

Referring to amendment numbered 3, relating to investigations, observations and reports, forecasts, warnings, and advices for agricultural interests during the harvest season, was that included or did the Senate recede on that amendment?

Mr. McNARY. What page is that on, please?

Mr. HARRISON. That is on page 15 of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. The Senate receded on that.

Mr. HARRISON. The other important item is amendment numbered 4, about spraying.

Mr. McNARY. The Senate receded on that item.

Mr. HARRISON. As to amendment numbered 5, touching the white-pine blister rust, the Senate receded on that, did it?

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator that the House receded on that item and the \$50,000 which was added to the bill for the purpose of scouting work in connection with the infestation of Northwestern States was retained; so the item is \$250,000 rather than \$200,000, as passed by the House.

Mr. HARRISON. Was amendment numbered 8, with respect to sugar-plant investigation, retained?

Mr. McNARY. The House receded from that, and the Senate amendment adding \$10,000 was accepted.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from California is now in his seat with respect to his amendment.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, may I inquire touching the item referred to? I was not in the Chamber when it was brought up.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator from California as to the item he had incorporated in the Agricultural bill, which, as I was led to believe, was quite important to the people of California—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It certainly was, and is.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senate has receded, or is about to recede when it adopts this report, on that item, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was just discussing it. He took a different view from that presented by the Senator from California; and I just expressed to him the thought that if he had heard the distinguished Senator from California present this matter he would have the same conviction that I have, namely, that the Senator from California was correct, and that the Senate should not have receded from this item.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I thank the Senator for his expressions. I recall the discussion concerning that particular item. I assume that many Senators present also recall what was then said. I made an effort to have the appropriation increased, but under a point of order, which was sustained by the Presiding Officer, my amendment so to increase was ruled out. The upshot of the discussion was that of the \$502,000 mentioned in the bill to be devoted to the purposes stated the Senate voted in effect to give permission to the Secretary of Agriculture to devote \$150,000 of that sum to California in and about the destruction of these very destructive predatory animals.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Was any reason given, if that amendment was not placed in the bill, why the Secretary could not expend that amount in the Senator's State?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. An effort was made in the House by Representative RAKER to incorporate that sum in the bill, and make it in effect permissive for the Secretary of Agriculture to expend that amount in the State of California for the purpose named. His effort was unsuccessful, because of a point of order raised.

To repeat myself, if the Senator desires to hear an answer to his question—

Mr. WARREN. If there is an answer to it, I should like to hear it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; I say, an effort was made in the House to have this sum made available for the purpose stated, and to be devoted to the State of California, reasons being assigned. That effort was unsuccessful. The bill came here. I moved to amend it by increasing the amount by \$150,000 for those purposes. A point of order was raised and sustained as to increasing the amount, so that the amount devoted to the various purposes was left at \$502,000. I believe that was the sum. I then moved to add a proviso, which is found in the bill, that of the \$502,000 the sum of \$150,000 might be expended in the State of California. In perfect candor I stated that it was not mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to devote that amount to that State; that it was permissive; and it took on that form.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Was there any language in the bill which would have forbidden the Secretary of Agriculture devoting to California for the extermination of predatory animals such portion of the fund appropriated as he deemed necessary and equitable, taking into account the needs of the other States?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In a word, I answer "No." Of course, Senators will also recall that I did not forget Arizona or Utah or Colorado—

Mr. KING. Or California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Or other States infested by these predatory animals; but I ventured to call the attention of the Senate

to the fact that California was territorially a very large State; that a vast percentage of her lands is public lands; and that of the public lands a large percentage is mountain and forest, the breeding place of these predatory animals, so that, to make an end of the matter, the amendment in the nature of a proviso was an expression, perhaps, of the feeling of the Senate in respect to the State of California and its needs, wherefore the amendment was permissive, not mandatory; and in that fashion it was approved by the Senate and found its way into the bill. I was not in the Chamber when the report of the conferees was taken up, but I see no reason why that expression of the Senate should not remain in the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. In the absence of the Senator and when the item was inquired about by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] had stated what the action of the conferees was, I suggested that I thought their action in eliminating the proviso which the able Senator from California had had sufficient influence in the Senate to have inserted in the bill was very wise; that where a fund of this character was appropriated for a certain section where there is a good deal of homogeneity, if I may use that expression, with respect to the section and its needs and purposes, I regarded it as rather unfair and unwise to segregate, even by a permissive expression in the bill, the fund itself, because that very permissive expression would be regarded by the able Senator from California, and certainly by his constituents, as being a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to expend at least that amount in California, and it would be seized upon by those who sought the expenditure of that fund in California as a fulcrum for tremendous propaganda to bring pressure to bear upon the Secretary of Agriculture to induce him to expend the entire sum in that State. So I was very glad when the Senate conferees, out of the plenitude of their great wisdom, saw fit to yield upon this matter of disagreement and failed to follow the distinguished and able Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I am sometimes reluctantly forced to concede that I have not very much influence. But not to detain the Senate long, in point of very truth that proviso should have been mandatory in its terms. If it were worth while, or I thought my words to be effective here to-day, I would urge that the amount specified be expended in my State. The conditions were such, they are such, as to warrant that expenditure. I sought to have the \$502,000 item enhanced by \$150,000, the latter sum to be devoted to California, but my effort in that direction was defeated by the point of order raised, not by the other side, if there be two sides in this Chamber, but by mine own particular friends. I had then to content myself with what was done by the Senate. I am not here questioning the wisdom of the conferees, though perhaps all wisdom will not die with them. "If mine enemy had exalted himself before me, peradventure I could have borne it," but mine own particular friends—that is beyond patient bearing.

Mr. KING. Et tu Brute!

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Has the conference report been agreed to?

Mr. McNARY. It has.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What is the immediate matter before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to agree to the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 11, 31, 33, and 35, and to recede from its amendment numbered 34.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the conference report had not been agreed to in the Senate, would not that be the first proposition to be submitted to the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. May I ask, for information, as to whether amendment numbered 22 was agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Amendment numbered 22 has already been agreed to.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I move to reconsider the vote by which amendment numbered 22 was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would reopen the whole conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be necessary to move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the conference report.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I make such motion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that the statement of the Chair means that the report of the conferees upon all items of disagreement has been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Except five items which were reported in disagreement. The others have been agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I inquire further, if the Chair will indulge me, whether that was upon some preceding day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was; the 22d of January.

Mr. KING. I was not here and was not advised of it. Then the matters now before the Senate are matters which had not been agreed upon; the bill went back to conference, and this is the final report of the conferees?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill went back to the House and the House acted on certain amendments to it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do not wish to detain the Senate or provoke discussion, but to the end that this particular amendment, numbered 22, may be considered on its merits, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted.

Mr. LENROOT. May I inquire when the conference report was agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On January 22.

Mr. LENROOT. More than two legislative days have intervened, and I make the point of order that the motion is not in order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, was this particular item in the conference report which was agreed to?

Mr. McNARY. This particular item was considered by the conferees, of course, and the Senate conferees receded, and on the 22d of January the report was adopted, except as to the five items which are now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Then the report of the conferees was not adopted as a whole, but it was in part adopted.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the item in which the Senator is interested one of the items included in the motion of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think not.

Mr. NORRIS. The item in which the Senator is interested has already been passed on by the adoption of the conference report?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. So I am informed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is clearly out of order to undertake to reconsider a conference report agreed to on the 22d.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so rules.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I did not know I had lost the floor. I only yielded to the Senator from California to discuss what I thought was a very important amendment. I thought I still held the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not desire to take the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I just wanted to inquire about some of the items in the conference report. I remember I asked the Senator from Oregon about the item on page 41, where the Senate amended the appropriation of \$110,000, and made it \$135,000, for silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations with respect to our forests. Did the Senate recede on that item?

Mr. McNARY. The Senate receded on that item so that there would be sufficient funds to erect forest stations in the New England country and the Great Lakes region.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the House recede on the item with respect to the corn borer. The Senate adopted an amendment to that item.

Mr. McNARY. The House receded on that item.

Mr. HARRISON. That is one victory for the Senate, then. The amendment on page 55, amendment No. 22, is the one we have been discussing, which affects California and which the Senator from California has done everything in his power to bring to the attention of the Senate, but which he can not bring to our attention because of the rules. Amendment No. 25 is for the enforcement of the United States grain standards act.

Mr. McNARY. The House receded on that, with an amendment. The amount now appropriated is \$541,223.

Mr. HARRISON. The House receded on that?

Mr. McNARY. The House receded, with an amendment. The amount was decreased \$5,000.

Mr. HARRISON. There was a kind of a dog fall there. Amendment numbered 27, on page 72, referred to the distribu-

tion of the publications on "Diseases of the Horse" and "Diseases of Cattle." Did the Senate recede on that?

Mr. McNARY. The House receded on that item.

Mr. HARRISON. Amendment numbered 28 was a very important one. I recall that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] talked a good deal about the black-leg disease. What was done with respect to that amendment?

Mr. McNARY. The Senate receded on that amendment for the reason that the item was not at the proper place, and another provision of the bill takes care of the item.

Mr. HARRISON. So it is taken care of?

Mr. McNARY. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. So the black leg will be treated. Then there was an amendment touching the motor-vehicle proposition. I do not see the Senator from Tennessee in his seat at this time. He has given great study to this motor-vehicle proposition. Was amendment numbered 29 accepted by the House?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that the House receded from its disagreement on that item.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senate was again triumphant.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is always so when it increases appropriations, especially for extravagances of that kind.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Oregon about that item?

Mr. McNARY. It was to effect an economy in travel from station to station by those connected with the department, that they might receive compensation for gasoline they use rather than hire a vehicle to carry them from place to place.

Mr. HARRISON. Was amendment numbered 30 agreed to by the House, the amendment with respect to the Center Market?

Mr. McNARY. The House receded on that amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. That is a very important amendment. Did the House agree to amendment 31, on page 84?

Mr. McNARY. The House receded on that, with an amendment. The Senate attempted to make the law permanent by using the word "hereafter." The House receded with an amendment so as to make it applicable only for the year 1924.

Mr. HARRISON. What was done with respect to amendment numbered 34, relating to the purchase of seed for drought-stricken areas?

Mr. McNARY. That was in disagreement. It went back to the House, and their conferees' action was sustained, and it is here now before the Senate for action.

Mr. HARRISON. That is one of the amendments now pending?

Mr. McNARY. That and the one relating to maximum salaries.

Mr. HARRISON. Was there a separate vote in the House on that proposition?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have, and they insisted on their disagreement.

Mr. HARRISON. That, perhaps, will be debated somewhat again, will it not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It will not be debated by me.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator must have very strong convictions on the subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am convinced that the House would not recede, and I think it would be a waste of time to discuss it in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. What was done with respect to the amendment regarding the barberry bush?

Mr. McNARY. I think I answered an inquiry in regard to that propounded by the Senator from Mississippi a few moments ago.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I did not ask with respect to the barberry. I asked with respect to the corn borer and the Mexican bean beetle, I believe it is called, and the sweet-potato weevil, but not this particular item.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I am afraid my friend is more interested in asking questions than listening to the answers, because the Senator from Oregon explained that item a moment ago.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not see my friend from Wisconsin present when barberry came up. It is so closely allied to some other names that are nearly like "barberry" that I really did not pay attention to the answer.

Mr. McNARY. Answering the Senator from Mississippi, the House provided \$350,000. The Senate added \$150,000, making a total of \$500,000. We compromised on the basis of \$425,000, with \$125,000 to be used in cooperation with the various States where the infestation occurs.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on yesterday the President of the United States, through the Vice President, delivered an address to the heads of the departments of the Government in

the city of Washington. He praised the Bureau of the Budget. He assumed responsibility for the estimates that had been submitted to the Congress. In the closing sentence of that address the President of the United States said:

I tender my thanks and appreciation for services rendered.

In the course of the speech, however, the President said—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator continues his speech would he be willing to yield, that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow at 1 o'clock, if the rural credits bill (S. 4287) has not then been disposed of, all debate upon the bill be limited to 20 minutes upon the bill and to 10 minutes upon any amendment pending or that may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HARRISON. Let the Secretary state the proposition, so we may understand it clearly.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. That from and after 1 o'clock p. m. on to-morrow no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes upon the bill, nor more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment that may then be pending or that may be offered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Gooding | McCormick | Smith |
| Ball | Hale | McCumber | Smoot |
| Borah | Harris | McKellar | Stanfield |
| Brookhart | Harrison | McNary | Sterling |
| Cameron | Heflin | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Capper | Hitchcock | New | Swanson |
| Caraway | Johnson | Norbeck | Townsend |
| Couzens | Jones, Wash. | Norris | Trammell |
| Culberson | Kellogg | Oddie | Underwood |
| Curtis | Kendrick | Overman | Wadsworth |
| Ernst | King | Phipps | Walsh, Mass. |
| Fletcher | Ladd | Poinexter | Walsh, Mont. |
| Frelinghuysen | La Follette | Pomeroy | Warren |
| Georg | Lenroot | Ransdell | |
| Glass | Lodge | Shields | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the request be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. That from and after 1 o'clock p. m. on to-morrow no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes upon the bill, nor more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment that may then be pending or that may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that there are some very important amendments to the bill, and there are some of us who up to this time have not discussed the particular measure now pending. We very much desire to discuss it at the proper time. It is foolish to attempt to discuss an amendment before it is pending. On yesterday I offered two amendments to the bill, one which would compel the Federal Farm Loan Board to locate in each agricultural or live-stock State a branch bank or agency where a Federal land bank was not located in that particular State. I have an idea that we ought to carry this proposition just as close to the people as it is possible. I believe that by the establishment in each State of an agency or branch bank more people would have an opportunity to take advantage of the provisions of the bill, more people would come within the provisions of the bill, and greater relief would be carried to them. I have every hope that the amendment will be agreed to. If there is any opposition to it, there ought to be full discussion of it, and no one, not even the Senator from Wisconsin, with all his ingenuity and splendid ability, could properly discuss it in 10 minutes. Yet if the unanimous-consent request should be granted we would be precluded from talking longer than 10 minutes on an important amendment like that.

I offered another amendment yesterday. Those amendments, perhaps, are not any more important in the opinion of various

individual Senators than the amendments which they themselves have offered. The other amendment which I offered would permit the credit association to loan directly to the individual. Senator after Senator has stated that he would be glad to see such a system put in operation; that certainly it would remove the increased interest rates which a bank would be permitted to charge upon the individual when they discount the individual's paper, and then go to the credit association and get the paper rediscounted. In other words, we will open up a channel or an avenue so that the individual may go direct to the credit association and borrow money if he has adequate security. That is an important amendment. That is an amendment which would bring sure enough relief to the farmers of the country, and would remove an overhead in interest charges that would be tremendous.

Does any one mean to tell me that an amendment of such magnitude and importance as that could be discussed by any Senator within the limit of 10 minutes? It is too important for such a limitation. Free and full discussion should be allowed on all the amendments that may be offered and upon the merits of the bill.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], laboring in behalf of the farmers of the country, wants agricultural relief. He believes the best way to get it is through what is known as the Norbeck bill. There are others who hold different views. We think the best way to get real legislation at this time is through the pending measure, with some amendments. The Senator from South Dakota will, no doubt, offer his bill at some stage of the proceeding as a substitute for the pending bill or in some other form, and a matter of such tremendous importance as that can not be discussed in 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that while the question of a unanimous-consent agreement is subject to debate, if the Senator desires to object, the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to agree to the amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the Agricultural Department appropriation bill is now pending.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped that I might convince the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] that his unanimous-consent request is not reasonable, that the time is too short, and that the unanimous-consent request might be withdrawn at this time. After we have discussed the bill in all its phases, as the Senate has done other measures from time immemorial, then we could agree on a unanimous-consent request that might take care of the situation. For that reason I reserved the right for the moment to object, thinking we might agree to something satisfactory to all.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator that the War Department appropriation bill has been reported to the Senate, and the practice has been to consider appropriation bills, I believe, prior to considering other measures. We are not certain how long this particular bill may be before the Senate for consideration, or when it may be laid aside in order to take up an appropriation bill. Therefore, I think it is hardly fair to ask to limit debate upon the bill at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. I was going to come to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Florida objects.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the Presiding Officer will be very patient with us. This manner of discussion is about as good as any other way to discuss the proposition. There has been no call by any Senator on the other side of the Chamber for the regular order. I dislike to object to the unanimous-consent request, and I thought, perhaps, after we had exchanged views here we might get together upon a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at a certain time upon the bill; but certainly at this time we ought not to limit debate on amendments and on the bill to the short time which is proposed in the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator from Mississippi think that if Senators would be willing to devote themselves to the consideration of the bill and to cut out extraneous subjects, in the discussion of which I thought the Senator from Mississippi was about to indulge when I asked him to yield to me, we could discuss the very matters to which the Senator has referred, and dispose of them before the limit would begin on debate on the pending bill?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator says that if we would confine our remarks to the bill, and if I would stop what he thought I was going to say when he interrupted me, the bill might be speedily disposed of. The Senator does not do me justice. The matter which was before the Senate was a motion by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] touching the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill. In connection

with that a question arose with respect to the estimates of the Budget Bureau, and I was just starting with a discussion of the Budget Bureau and the expressions of the President yesterday relating to its activities. Then I was going to try to get down to this particular item in order to show that the President had condemned what the Senate did the other day in surrendering to the Budget Bureau all of the power of the Senate to increase an appropriation, although the increase was warranted by all the facts and by the statements of experts; so that so far as confining the discussion to the merits of the subject is concerned, I was going to discuss the merits of the proposition when the Senator from Wisconsin interrupted me.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator indicate how long he will take in order to develop that very interesting subject in all of its ramifications?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senators on the other side would not interrupt me and cause me to branch off on side issues, it would not take very long.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to offer as an amendment to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement that consent also be granted that there shall be no further consideration of the ship subsidy bill at this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hold that the unanimous-consent proposition submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin has been objected to at the present time. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to propose a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that not later than 4 o'clock on next Tuesday all debate close upon the agricultural credits bill, so called; that we begin at that hour to vote upon any amendment that may be then pending until the bill is either passed or defeated; and that during that time no other matter shall be brought before the Senate for discussion or passage except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am constrained to object to that request, because I feel certain that we shall dispose of the bill before that time without any limit of debate of the character suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is interposed.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish again to announce, in view of the failure of the Senate to come to any agreement for the final disposition of the bill, that I shall ask the Senate, beginning to-morrow night, if the bill shall not by that time have been disposed of, to sit in evening session until it shall be disposed of.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very sorry that the Senator from Wisconsin has objected to my request for unanimous consent. I tried to point out—though I did not finish because of an interruption—why I thought the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Wisconsin was not exactly fair. I had referred to the very important amendment which will be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK]. It will be recalled also that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has an amendment, in the form of a bill, I believe, heretofore introduced by him. It is a very good bill and a very important proposition. He has very strong views with respect to the merits of his bill, and I understand he may offer it in the form of an amendment as a substitute for the pending bill. To try to confine that Senator to a 10 minutes' discussion of so important a question, I say is most unreasonable.

Under the proposal that I made, if we had secured such a unanimous-consent agreement, within six days or a week the debate would be closed, and we could vote upon the agricultural credits bill, after disposing of all amendments. So we could proceed in an orderly way throughout this week without killing Senators by holding night sessions, and compelling them to answer roll calls, and at least half of the time about 99 per cent of the Senators absenting themselves from the Chamber and paying no attention to the discussion. If the proposal which I made had not been objected to, the agricultural credits bill would be out of the way and over to the House of Representatives by next Tuesday night. We could then take up the Army appropriation bill, which is the only appropriation bill, I believe, yet remaining to be considered by the Senate; we could take up measures by unanimous consent and could pass them; but now, under whip and spur of the Senate majority, we are to be compelled to attend night sessions, to meet at 11

o'clock in the morning, with the hope that the pending bill may be passed by to-morrow or Thursday. The Senator from Wisconsin knows it can not pass by that time; no Senator here believes it can pass by that time; and if there is anybody in the country who thinks it can be passed by that time, he is laboring under an erroneous impression.

I violate no secret when I say that at least some of us on this side of the Chamber want to see every appropriation bill passed during the present session of Congress; we want to see the agricultural credit legislation enacted into law before the 4th day of March, and we are willing to cooperate, as we have cooperated up until this good hour and will continue to cooperate, until those two things have been accomplished. When, however, we have said that, we stop, because we are not going to cooperate with the Republican side in the effort to pass through the Senate and through the Congress a ship-subsidy proposal which we believe will increase the burden of taxes upon the American people through subsidy to a shipping trust in the amount of \$750,000,000 or more. The Senators on the other side are aware of our plan. If they want us to cooperate so that we may proceed in an orderly way and pass much proposed legislation that is now on the Calendar and that is needed by various localities, that has been promised by numerous Senators, many bills could be taken up by unanimous consent and passed after brief discussion and consideration. If Senators on the other side want that, if they want cooperation to that extent, we will give it to them; but if they expect to use strong-arm methods and to hold night sessions in order to ram through this Congress a ship subsidy bill, then I tell them there will be a little trouble encountered on this side of the Chamber and I believe from certain Members on the other side of the Chamber.

When I make that statement I am not talking as a member of the Democratic Party, because if I were to speak as a Democrat I would wish the Republican majority to pass a ship subsidy proposal. I know nothing that would more inure to the benefit and advantage of the Democratic Party than to have the present administration top off the work of this Congress by passing legislation that would impose additional burdens upon our now oppressed taxpayers in the sum of \$750,000,000 or \$850,000,000. If that measure were passed, all the eloquence possessed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, by the Senator from Wisconsin, and by the Senator from Washington, and all the activities and eloquence of various Members of the Cabinet could not answer for such action as that.

So my efforts against the ship subsidy bill is as an American, in order to save the taxpayers of this country from further burdens. So I say to Senators on the other side that if I would lay aside my Americanism and act merely as a partisan I would want to see them pass the ship subsidy bill; but I am not willing at this time, when the farmers throughout the country are receiving unremunerative prices for their products, when laborers' wages are being threatened with reduction, when the consuming masses are being extorted and gouged by profiteers in every city and village and hamlet throughout the country, when taxation is crowding itself day by day in increased volume upon the people, to see this outrage perpetrated when it can be prevented.

The Republican majority have done so many foolish things since they came into power that some of us would exert ourselves in order to save them from their own folly. So after the 4th of March I think I can see the Senator from Massachusetts, the leader of his party in this Chamber, and other majority Senators come over to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], come over to my friend from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], and to my friend from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], and over to me and shake our hands, pat us on the back, and say, "Boys, I am mighty glad you did it." Why, you ought to feast us and dine us after the 4th of March for saving you from the folly of passing the ship subsidy bill.

So, Mr. President, why can we not proceed in an orderly way, and all of us get along nicely by meeting here at 12 o'clock or, if necessary, sometimes at 11 o'clock, work our six or seven hours in the day, discuss these measures as they should be discussed, pass the Army appropriation bill, as expressed by a majority of this body, pass the agricultural credits bill, pass these bills that are upon the calendar that have been promised the people, and abandon this idea of passing a ship subsidy bill at this session?

You know you are not treating the people fairly when you attempt to do it. You are not just on the level with them when you bring this bill in at this short session and try to force it to enactment. Why, you know if you had told the American people in the last campaign that you intended to follow this

procedure more of you would have been lost in the catastrophe than did fall by the wayside. Why did you not tell them at the time that immediately after the election an extra session of Congress would be called and that you would propose this legislative monstrosity to add further burdens to the taxpayers of America? But you did not do it. The only hint that was given, the only suggestion that came with respect to the ship subsidy bill and an extra session of Congress, was when the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. GILLET, and the leader of the Republicans in the House, Mr. MONDELL, visited the White House, held a conference with President Harding, and one of them, upon coming out of the White House, in talking to a newspaper reporter, let the cat out of the bag and said that the President was going to call an extra session of Congress.

Why, I could hear it whispered among the leaders over there, I could hear it among Republicans everywhere, that it was poor politics for the President even to think of such a thing, and they condemned the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the leader of the Republicans in the House for having given such a statement to the press, saying "That in itself will lose us millions of votes in the coming election." So through the days intervening between the publicity of that statement and the election Republican leaders and spellbinders all over the country were busy trying to repudiate those statements and raise a doubt in the minds of the American people as to whether or not the President intended anything thereby; but as soon as the election is over, with a crowd of distinguished lame ducks who have my sympathy and whom I love—they carry back to their homes and their States my fondest respect and very best wishes—I say to them, I say to you who control in this body the destinies of the Republican Party to-day, and to those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, that it is not fair to the American people to take the votes of Senators who have been repudiated at the polls and pass through this body a ship subsidy bill that means so much to the American shipping interest and so much to the American taxpayer. If you want to be fair with them, follow orderly procedure here; call an extra session of Congress immediately after the 4th of March, composed of new Senators, composed of Representatives of the American people fresh from the people, whose wishes were expressed to their constituents, whose views were known, and let them handle the ship subsidy bill as they will in that extra session of Congress.

No; you do not want an extra session of Congress. You do not want these new Representatives and Senators fresh from the people to deal with this question. I dare you to follow that procedure. There is not a Senator here who believes that if this proposal should be given to the new Senate and to the new House of Representatives it would stand a chance even of getting out of the Commerce Committee; and none of you think or have a thought that you could pass it through the Senate of the United States. Why, you know now that if it should come to a vote there would not be two votes difference on the measure; that if you passed it, it would be merely by the skin of your teeth, so to speak; and with a great change after the 4th of March in the personnel of this body and of the House of Representatives, you know that it would not stand any chance at all.

So I submit to you leaders over there that you should follow in the orderly way your program. Let us get through with the Army bill. Let us get through with the agricultural credits bill. Let the President take the American people into his confidence; and oh, why do not some of you advise him? Why do not some of you tell him what to do? God knows he does not know what to do, or, if he does know, he gives no evidence of it. Why do you not tell him the deplorable situation, not only in this body but in the House of Representatives and all over the country? Why do you not lay aside your flattery and go up there and say: "Mr. President, you are losing caste. You have lost the popularity that swept in a mighty wave over this country during the days of the Disarmament Conference. The folks in every State and in every part of the country have been disillusioned. They are tired of waiting on your negative, do-nothing policy. They want to be told what is going to happen to-morrow by the Government that runs affairs." Tell him how he is losing caste with the labor element, how he has lost caste with the farmers, how business is halting, and how disgusted all classes are. Tell him of some of the private things you hear here touching the management of foreign affairs and of domestic policies. Be on the square with your President. Open his eyes to the true situation, and tell him, if you will, that if he does not wait until an extra session of Congress is called to force through this last monstrosity the American people will lose all faith—and they have mighty nearly lost all faith now—in the Republican Party.

I do not want to see you disappear from view entirely. God knows I do not mind your shriveling up a little bit; but we want to have a foemen that is worthy of our steel, and the way you are going down grade there will not be a respectable minority in this country to fight and withstand the onslaughts of Democracy two years from now. So, now, take the President into your confidence. Take into your confidence Mr. Lasker, who says he going to resign if you do not pass this bill. He is not going to resign. This is the best job he ever had in the world. He likes it; but tell him the situation, and put it up to him that he should have more interest in the welfare of the Republican Party than he has in a shipping trust that wants to extort greater taxes from the people.

I have said this much in the hope that it might help you. I have given you this advice without suggestion from you and without expectation of reward, and I hope you will follow it.

Let me plead with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], in the interest of expediting legislation, that they will agree to the request that I made. If they will, if they will just say they will, we will call a quorum, I will make again the proposal which will insure the agricultural credits bill being passed by next Tuesday night, we can then get to work on the Army bill, and we will have a good time from now to the 4th of March.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If there is bound to be a filibuster—of course that is the right of any one under the rules—will not the Senator postpone that until after this agricultural bill is passed? Will he not consent to consider the very important amendments of which he speaks? Will he not please let us consider this bill?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I see that my remarks have had no effect at all upon the Senator from Wisconsin. He is just a hardened political sinner. He is beyond redemption. The Senator from Wisconsin is generally as fair as he is able. He made a speech yesterday—I was surprised when I read it, but I saw it in the Record this morning—and in the course of those remarks he said that there was great delay with respect to this agricultural credits bill, and he charged the delay to the farm bloc in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator is wrong about that. The statement was made by the Senator from South Dakota, who charged delay. My response was that there was delay, but the fault for delay was with the farm bloc.

Mr. HARRISON. Here is exactly what the Senator said, and it gives the impression that the fault of this delay is with the farm bloc. Here is what the Senator said:

Mr. President, I merely raise this question because of the intimation of the Senator from South Dakota, made in the utmost good faith, that somebody—he did not say who—was responsible for this agricultural credit bill being brought in at this late date. I would like to have the record straight. This bill was introduced by me more than a year ago. I secured very promptly the appointment of a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. On March 10, 1922, almost a year ago, I appeared before that subcommittee and argued in favor of the passage of this bill. At the request of members of the farm bloc I did not press the bill, because it was represented to me that the farm bloc were discussing the whole question of farm credit legislation and would like to have the Committee on Banking and Currency take no action until they were ready to make some report. I acceded to that, and, in view of that fact, I do not think it is quite fair to apply any criticism to me or to the Committee on Banking and Currency when, if there be anyone responsible for the delay in this credit legislation, it is the farm bloc itself; and I am not criticizing them.

Mr. President, I do not know that anybody in particular is to blame for the delay of this legislation. I am not charging that the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate is to blame. I know that the farm bloc is not to blame. I know that the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, of which the Senator was a most influential member, was not to blame. I will tell you where the blame was—not with the Banking and Currency Committee particularly, although this matter did lie dormant for a long time, just sleeping, so to speak, and evidently they forgot about the splendid argument presented to the subcommittee by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin after he had made that argument, because then the matter lay in abeyance for quite a good long while.

Mr. President, the first suggestion as to agricultural credits legislation at this time came either from members of the farm bloc in the Senate or from the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry. The Commission on Agricultural Inquiry began work soon after the Republicans got into control of the Congress, and we studied the question and reported out a bill. There were many divergent views with respect to that legislation. It might be very truthfully said that the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry delayed the proposition, if the Senator

could be correct in what he said about the farm bloc, because the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry took weeks, aye, I may say months, in order to form conclusions and write a bill; but during all that time we were having hearings, we were drawing from every part of the country experts who we believed could give us some good suggestions. We called in the head of the Federal land bank system here; we called in Mr. Meyer; we called in everybody whom we thought might aid us in coming to a conclusion with respect to the matter.

The Senator knows that we worked diligently; he said so in his speech. I agree with him that no commission ever worked more diligently than did that particular commission. They worked at night, and I think it was during the time the tariff bill was being discussed in the Senate, and many other matters were before us for discussion; but we finally agreed upon a measure and it was reported by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Is it to be said the farm bloc delayed things? The farm bloc appointed a subcommittee to work out this proposition so that the views of various Senators might be reconciled, and we could present to the full farm bloc, and in turn the farm bloc agree upon some method by which we could put the whole force of the farm bloc behind the proposition. Although the tariff was being discussed in the Senate at that time and other important matters were before the Senate, that subcommittee worked day and night. They called in witnesses from far and near, and finally they agreed that the Lenroot bill was perhaps the best bill that could be passed during this session. That subcommittee of the farm bloc, in doing that, did not discount the splendid merits of the Norbeck bill; it did not intend to discredit the splendid provisions of the Simmons bill, but it believed that we could obtain some legislation giving to the farmers an agricultural credits system by urging the passage of the Lenroot-Anderson bill, and not the Norbeck or the Simmons bill.

All the measures seek to do the same thing; all represent efforts to serve the farmers, to give to them credit for such time as will take care of their turnover from production to harvest time. I do not speak in disparagement of the Lenroot bill, because I think it is a wise proposal. I want to see some amendments made to it, but as a whole it affords a splendid system, well worked out, and one which will bring untold benefits to the agricultural interests of the country; but in my opinion the thing which moved the subcommittee of the farm bloc more than anything else to indorse the Lenroot bill, with certain modifications, was that the members of the farm bloc, as well as some other friends of the farmers in this body who were not members of the farm bloc, had crystallized public opinion in this country to the extent that some agricultural credits bill must be championed by this administration, and must be passed by Congress. That crystallization of public opinion, I say, was brought about through the activities of the farm bloc and the friends in this body and in the other Chamber of agricultural credits legislation.

The Senator who sits before me [Mr. BROOKHART] is a splendid successor to a most distinguished ex-Member of this body, Senator Kenyon, who when he was a Member of this body lifted his voice in behalf of the farmers of the country, and after he called meetings night after night of the farm bloc in his committee room and they discussed these problems meaning so much to the farming interests of the country would announce to the press what they had done, and the press of the country would carry it everywhere. In that way sentiment was crystallized for agricultural credits legislation. In my humble opinion, if it had not been for the organization in this Congress of a farm bloc little or nothing would have been done for the great agricultural interests of this country. The farm bloc forced the cooperative marketing bill through this body. The farm bloc helped in the passage of packer legislation. The farm bloc stood here as mighty champion for the people, trying to withstand assaults on the revenue laws, so that Senators on the other side would not take off the high surtaxes from the rich of the country and place them where they could be least easily borne. It was the coalition formed by Senators on this side and a few on the other side, and championed by the farm bloc, that held the surtaxes as high as they were kept, over the suggestion and against the protest of President Harding and Secretary Mellon.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. In one moment. It will not be forgotten how the Secretary of the Treasury sent his messages and reports here asking us to reduce the surtaxes from 68 per cent, I think, down to 25 per cent, and how the President brought to bear the power and influence of his office to get it down to 32

per cent; but he did not succeed, because of the farm bloc, the coalition between the Democratic forces in this body and the progressive Members of the Republican Party. Now I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was simply going to remark that in enumerating the great benefits the farm bloc have rendered to the country, I hoped the Senator would not forget to enumerate the excessively high tariff duties levied upon raw wool, due largely to the farm bloc.

Mr. HARRISON. That illustrates one of the troubles we encounter. There has been a certain element in this country that has attempted to make the people believe that the farm bloc indorsed those conscienceless rates on wool and on sugar, and yet the farm bloc at no meeting it ever had ever considered the question of a tariff on everything. The men who for the most part conspired to put the high tariff on wool were not members of the farm bloc. Some of the influential members of the farm bloc were particeps criminis to the other proposition, but the crowd which put the high-tariff duties on raw wool was what was known as the tariff bloc, and was headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho, my friend Mr. GOODING. So the farm bloc had nothing to do with that piece of legislative monstrosity.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to confirm what the Senator has said to the effect that there has been some misuse of the term "farm bloc." As the Senator from Mississippi has observed, the farm bloc never attempted to consider tariff matters or any party question. Afterwards some members, perhaps of what was known as the farm bloc, engineered some provisions in the tariff bill, and it got to be known as the farm-bloc movement in connection with the tariff; but it was entirely distinct and separate, and not in any wise properly lined up with what was known as the farm bloc.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] are not members of the farm bloc?

Mr. HARRISON. I know that some of them are members of the farm bloc. The Senator omitted to state the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. He should not leave out that good shepherd.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I quite agree with the Senator. They certainly are members of the wool bloc.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; they certainly are members of the wool bloc. They are all wool and a yard wide. So much for the tariff bloc and the farm bloc. They are distinct and different entities.

I say that the farm bloc was the one that crystallized public sentiment in this country for agricultural credits legislation. Are we to be blamed now for delaying two or three days, say, so that we can adequately discuss the agricultural credits bill, when we know it is going to pass, a bill we are all in favor of, though some of us want to put amendments to it, when 12 months or more ago the Senate, controlled by the same leadership that now controls it, worked here for months to consider and have passed the tariff bill, a measure laying greater burdens on the people, while this one is to relieve the people of many burdens; yet there was no enthusiasm upon the part of the leadership on the other side during those long days that the tariff bill was being discussed in order to force an agricultural credits bill through at that time.

This bill would not now be considered in the Senate, and everyone who hears me knows it; it would have no chance in the world to be passed if it had not been that the President became aroused over the interest among the public for agricultural credits legislation. Indeed, he did not become aroused until the late election was held, and when the ides of November rolled around, and he saw this friend laid on the table, and this friend laid on the shelf, and he saw my friend from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK], seeing the breaker coming, get on the boat and sail across the placid waters of the Atlantic, cabling as he went away what would happen the next day to the Republican Party—it was only when the President saw those things that he became alive to the issue, and wanted some agricultural credits legislation. The first time the President ever hinted at any legislation for the farmers was in his message on the ship subsidy bill. He devoted about 55 minutes to a ship subsidy measure, to give to the shipping interests all these subsidies at the expense of the people, and two lines, which my friend Eugene Meyer evidently persuaded him to put in, touching agricultural credits legislation.

By the time the Congress convened in the regular session he had become wiser. Some of the members of the farm bloc had obtained an entrée to the White House. They had poured into

his ear some of the things the farmers of the great Middle West were saying about the Congress and the administration. He listened to their admonitions, and then it was that he incorporated in his message an urgent request for agricultural credit legislation. Why did he not do that way back yonder when the agricultural inquiry commission had made its report, when the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] had originally introduced the bill? If he had desired to do something for the farmer, that was the time. The tariff bill should have been laid aside and agricultural credits discussed then. Yes, Mr. President, everyone knows that it was the farm bloc that forced the hand of the President and caused him to make the request of Congress to enact agricultural credits legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator remember that more than a year ago the President called an agricultural conference which met in Washington? Does not the Senator remember the President's speech to that conference?

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator repeat his question? I did not hear him clearly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator remember that more than a year ago the President called an agricultural conference to meet here—

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, I was just coming to that. I am glad the Senator suggested it. It shows the importance of the part of the speech I am now going to make.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I hope the Senator will not overlook the fact that the present administration has substituted for a "watchful waiting" policy a "happy, hopeful" policy.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that is what our friend William Allen White said—a happy, hopeful policy instead of a watchful waiting policy. I do not know just how a fellow would feel if he was in a happy, hopeful way. He looks perfectly happy. He is sitting there with the whole world filled with uncertainty, threatened war all around us, discontent in this country, and yet he is supposed to be the watchman on the tower, but assumes a hopeful attitude. Then all of a sudden he becomes happy over this hopeful attitude. Not suggesting anything, not planning anything, not conferring with those in authority around him to arrive at a policy, yet in all this mess and mass of discontent our President assumes a happy, hopeful attitude.

So that is the compliment that is paid to the President by a distinguished Republican from the State of Kansas. I do not see my friend, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], now in his seat. He probably thought I was going to talk about William Allen White and left for that reason. "Happy, hopeful attitude!" Ten thousand times better is it for a President to assume a watchful waiting attitude than a happy, hopeful attitude.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] recalled to my mind an agricultural conference that was called in Washington, which the President addressed. One of the things said about that conference was the lack of applause and commendation through the crowd over one expression used by the President at that time. That expression was carried by the press all over the country and was read by the farmers of Iowa and Kansas and the other Western States. It was the expression employed by the President condemning the farm bloc of the United States Senate. Oh, they reported the coldness that enshrouded that meeting when he let loose his invective and condemnation of the farm bloc.

That, it will be recalled, was only a little while after Secretary of War Weeks had spoken at a banquet in New York City, a banquet that was attended by national bankers in large part and by the great manufacturers of that great metropolis. He was in his atmosphere there. He was among his friends in that gathering at that time. Oh, will you men from the agricultural West ever forget what Secretary of War Weeks said against the farm bloc and the members of the farm bloc? If you ever forget, how will you explain to your constituents, when you go before them two years from now, with reference to what he said against legislation that was forced through the Congress by the farm bloc?

That is the treatment the farm bloc gets at the hands of the administration. Not until its work was displayed throughout the country and sentiment crystallized was it that the President came to Congress and recommended the enactment of agricultural credit legislation. His attitude in this particular is a good deal like his attitude when the great Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] offered his resolution to call a disarmament conference. At first the President stood adamant. He said "no." The wires were busy from here to the other end of Penn-

sylvania Avenue. Leaders on the other side of the aisle talked to him and held up the provision in the naval appropriation bill. For weeks we talked. On this side of the Chamber we were lined up solidly for the Borah resolution. A few progressive Republicans on the other side stood side by side with the great Senator from Idaho.

Finally the country became aroused. They saw taxes piling up. They saw the heavy armaments being constructed. They read and saw for themselves that the naval appropriation bill in 1912 carried only \$160,000,000, while in 1922 it was \$560,000,000. They saw that in 1912 the Army appropriation bill carried only \$100,000,000, while in 1922 it had risen to \$350,000,000. So they became aroused.

The press of the country began to carry editorials. They brought pressure to bear on the President, and then he threw up the white flag and surrendered and sent word down to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], "Let it pass, boys, let it go through." From that day on the President was carrying the flag and the Secretary of State was trailing behind, both claiming all the credit for the disarmament conference. The disarmament conference has come and it has gone. Nobody knows now whether any country has ratified any of the treaties except the United States.

Thus it goes. Of course, we were led to believe then that taxes were going to be reduced, and yet the naval appropriation bill passed during the present month carried practically three times as much as the naval appropriation bill carried in the preparedness days immediately preceding the war when the highest amount was \$160,000,000. We have had reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, notwithstanding the disarmament conference, an appropriation bill carrying for the Army \$350,000,000, over three times as much as during the preparedness days immediately preceding the war.

Thus it is and thus it was that the President came to advocate agricultural credits legislation, and yet the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] chides us and says that the farm bloc was the cause of a great deal of delay.

Mr. President, I do not know that it is necessary for me to talk any more about the subject. I do not know just what is before the Senate. I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has a motion pending?

Mr. McNARY. That is correct.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. McNARY that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 31, 33, and 35 and recede from its amendment numbered 34 to the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desired to discuss the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] some two hours ago, but the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] got me off on another proposition. I shall now proceed to discuss the motion. When I was diverted I was about to discuss a speech that was made yesterday by the President of the United States. I had read the latter part of that speech where he expressed gratification over the fact that various men in the Government service had cooperated with him in a reduction of the estimates.

I was about to read, when I was interrupted, that part of the speech where the President had impliedly condemned the Senate for its attitude recently when we offered on the floor of the Senate amendments that had merit, but which did not have the sanction of the Bureau of the Budget and which had not been estimated for. I want the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who is now in the Chamber, to listen to me particularly when I read this part of the President's address. The President said:

It is the endeavor of the President to present to Congress calls for funds that are sufficient, and no more than sufficient, to carry out approved policies.

It is the duty of the President to estimate for those that are sufficient, said the President.

The Budget and accounting act places no limitation upon the power and right of Congress to increase or decrease estimates submitted—

Said the President.

This is in accord with the spirit of our institutions, and as it should be.

Mr. President, that reads like the eloquent speeches the President once made to the Senate when he talked about the dignity of the Senate and protested against Executive encroachment. Again, he gives utterance to the expression that

the Senate has the right and should exercise the function that is imposed by the Constitution of the United States. The President proceeded:

It is my hope and expectation that, as the Budget procedures develop, the estimates transmitted to Congress will be so carefully prepared and will present so accurate a picture of the real operating needs of the Government as materially to lighten the burden. But it is not expected or desired that Congress should relinquish any of its prerogatives regarding public funds—prerogatives so wisely given to the people's representatives by the founders of the Government.

So the President in those utterances first concedes the right of the Congress to increase appropriations over the estimates of the Budget, and then he admonishes the Congress that we have certain rights, that we are the representatives of the people, and that we should pass upon the matter. But he said in his speech that he assumes responsibility for the estimates and that the estimates he has given are those which in his opinion are based upon facts.

Let us see, Mr. President. Of course, in accordance with the law creating the Budget Bureau, the President has the power to reduce the estimates, but he delegates that power to certain representatives of the Budget Bureau. The President is too busy a man, he has too many duties, to look over the various estimates of all the departments of the Government. So it is natural and necessary that he should delegate that function to some one else. But in delegating that power he should know the character of the men to whom he has delegated it; he should acquaint himself with their fitness and their peculiar qualifications to perform the work. Has he done so? He is responsible for what these men do, for when they prepare the data and submit them to him he transmits them to Congress, and upon such information the Congress must act.

Under the antiquated rules of the Senate, Senators on the floor are prevented from offering an amendment proposing to increase the amount carried in an appropriation bill over the estimate which has been submitted by the Budget Bureau. That makes it so much more necessary and so much more important that the President should choose the right kind of men to go over the estimates and to submit them to him.

It would be a strange system of government indeed if, under the Budget system, there should be delegated to investigate the affairs of the Agricultural Department, for instance, and to prepare the estimates for that department, a man who is well versed in bookkeeping, who is well versed in the operations of a stock exchange in New York, who has thorough knowledge of the administration of a hotel in Chicago or elsewhere, but who knows nothing in the world about agriculture.

Indeed, if the President should adopt such a course under the Budget system, and the lack of qualifications of the Budget official should come to his knowledge, he would receive the condemnation instead of the praises of the American people. If he charged with the duty of examining the estimates for the War Department some person who was not qualified to do that work, some person who had never seen a cannon or a gun or a standing army, who knew nothing about the needs of an army, Senators would criticize him; everybody would find fault with him. If he should delegate to go into the Navy Department and look over the estimates prepared by the Navy experts and cut those estimates some man who knows nothing about the Navy, who never saw a battleship or a submarine, who had never been trained in that line of work, indeed, the President would rightfully receive the criticism of everybody.

So in the case of the Department of Commerce. The men who are delegated to examine the appropriations which are needed for the Department of Commerce and for the Department of Labor and for the various other branches of the Government ought to be men specially trained and qualified and fitted to pass on the estimates for those various departments, so that the President may transmit correct estimates to Congress. But what has been done? What has been the practice? Has the President sought men who are especially qualified to do that work? No.

Take the Agricultural Department, for instance, which has to do with an occupation which in this day and time should appeal more strongly to the President than any other. Why? Because wheat has gone down, corn has gone to a low price, the price of live stock is low; everything practically that the farmers of the country have produced in recent years has depreciated in value. The purchasing power of the farmer's dollar to-day is only about 70 cents, compared to what it formerly was; indeed, the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar to-day is lower than the purchasing power of the dollar of any man who is engaged in any other occupation in the country. So I say that, in view of the conditions confronting the American farmer, with his need for markets abroad, with his necessity for an adequate credit system at home, with increased prices for the products which the farmer has to buy,

some consideration should be accorded to him. The President should have seen that General Lord delegated some one to pass on estimates for the Agricultural Department who knew what the needs of agriculture were, so that the appropriations for agriculture might not be cut to the bone.

What was done? It is a matter of history now that last year a man who had been the manager of the Hotel La Salle in the city of Chicago; a man who had been an Army officer; who was not raised on a farm; who, perhaps, did not know whether a potato grew under the ground or on a tree, was delegated to revise the estimates which were prepared by the experts of the Agricultural Department. Then, he began to slash them without a program and without a policy, without rhyme or reason, until he had cut them about \$2,500,000. General Lord did not go over the Agricultural Department estimates, but he appointed some other man to go over them. It is all in the testimony. That man so designated took the figures and told the Secretary of Agriculture, or Doctor Ball, who was delegated by the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare the estimates for the department, that he wanted them cut about \$2,000,000. Those estimates had been prepared with great care, and with an idea to economize to the last degree; aye, they had been cut to such an extent that they were then some \$500,000 less than the appropriations which had been carried in the last agricultural appropriation bill; yet this man, whose name I do not now recall, delegated by the Budget Bureau to cut the estimates, served notice that they must be reduced \$2,000,000; so they were cut something like that, and the estimates which were prepared finally and agreed to by the Budget Bureau carry less, and considerably less, than the appropriations carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for last year.

The President, in his address yesterday, delivered through the Vice President, said, in substance: "We have given to Congress those things that they need; we have cut where the estimates should be cut." Then he thanked the various heads of the departments for cutting as they did. Let us look over the appropriations intended for the benefit of the farmers of the country. I am not going to discuss the Army appropriation bill; I am not going to call attention to the cut made by the Budget Bureau and approved by the President for the Army for the coming year; I am not going over the estimates prepared by the naval authorities and approved by the Budget Bureau for the Navy; I am not going to take up the appropriations for the Department of Commerce or for the Department of Labor, or for various other branches of the Government service, but I am going to take up the estimates for the Agricultural Department and one other matter, namely, river and harbor appropriations, which mean so much to the agricultural interests of America.

Now let us see the cut that the President of the United States, who now poses as a friend of American agriculture, has recommended; this President who now tries to force through the agricultural credits bill, but who did nothing for at least a year to ask Congress to pass an agricultural credits bill, who did not lift his voice or hand until public sentiment was aroused, as I said before, by the farm bloc.

Taking the items for the Agricultural Department, I will consider first the appropriation for extension work. Under that appropriation agents are sent throughout the country to try to instruct the farmers as to the best methods of farming. Under the same appropriation are employed demonstration agents, women as well as men, who go out to instruct the little boys and little girls to can fruits and vegetables, or to raise corn or to inoculate hogs, or to protect crops against insect pests and animals against diseases. The activities of the county agents and demonstration agents mean so much to the farmers of the country. They have saved millions and millions of dollars by the preservation of hogs, the eradication of tuberculosis from cattle, the destruction of insects of various kinds, helping the farmers to adjust conditions in their various localities so that they may prosper or, at least, live under the abnormal conditions which confront them; yet in the case of this important service of the Government, with people everywhere crying for it, demanding greater appropriations and showing that the needs are greater, the President suggests to Congress a reduction in this amount from \$1,300,000 to \$1,250,000. Oh, yes, he wanted to save \$50,000 to the taxpayers of the country, but how? By cutting it off this needed appropriation to carry on the work of maintaining county agents and demonstration agents in this country. Thus it is again manifested how the Bureau of the Budget and the present administration are favorably disposed toward the farmers of the country.

Now let us take another item, and I am just picking the items out piecemeal, for I merely wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the situation. I want the farmers of the

country to know, when it comes to cutting appropriations, that the cut is made in appropriations for their interest and not in those designed for a big Army and a big Navy and other appropriations devoted to Government work along other lines.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator ought to be fair in this matter. The facts have previously been called to his attention, and he knows what they are, and that the statements he is making are not sustained at all by the record.

In the first place, there never was a hotel man dictating appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. When General Dawes was put in charge of the Budget, he called to his assistance a number of business men from all over the country to visit some of the departments and study their expenditures. It happened that a hotel man from Chicago was sent to the Department of Agriculture, and stayed there for two or three weeks, studying the expenditures of the Agricultural Department. It is known to the Senator—it has been stated to him frequently—that every department has a Budget officer. The Agricultural Department has in the department its Budget officer, who has been with the department for years. He is still there. The Senator knows, because it was called to his attention before, that when the estimates were sent in by the heads of the departments to the Budget, the Budget concluded that the Government could be run with less money than had been asked for by the heads of the various departments; and the heads of the departments were not directed to take from this or that item, but the heads of the departments were asked to go over their estimates and reduce them so as to bring them within the recommended amount. That request went back to the head of the department, was referred to the Budget officer of the department, and the Budget officer concurred in the estimate that was finally sent in. The Senator knows all that; and yet this is the second or third time he has gotten up here and made statements that would indicate that some different plan was followed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He is very courteous and very kind. It so happened that I was a member of the subcommittee that framed the Agricultural bill last year. I do not know whether the Senator was or not. I never heard it denied, because the record speaks for itself, that last year—

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield before I proceed.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state to the Senator that I am not a member of the subcommittee that has charge of the agricultural appropriation bill, and I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; but when the Senator made his statement before I took the pains to call up the department, and wanted to know from the head of the department what the facts were, and I was given the information that I have given the Senate to-day.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator had been a member of the subcommittee he would not have made the statement he has just made. I am sorry the Senator fell into this error, because usually he does not state a thing unless he is absolutely sure of it. This is not his usual course. Last year—and it is in the Record—they were just trying out the Bureau of the Budget, just beginning; and General Dawes or General Lord, I do not know which—I think it was Dawes—

Mr. CARAWAY. Anyway, it was some Army officer that would not know a cow from a horse if the cow had been deborned.

Mr. HARRISON. It is very true, as the Senator says, that the Bureau of the Budget designates some one in the Bureau of the Budget to take up the estimates with the various departments and go over them. First, for instance, the Agricultural Department is supposed to get up its estimate, and then this representative of the Bureau of the Budget calls on the Agricultural Department, and they go over the matter together with any suggestions that the representative of the Bureau of the Budget may make. We agree thus far. The man that was designated by the Bureau of the Budget last year to go to the Secretary of Agriculture, or to those in charge of the estimates for the agricultural appropriation bill, was a man who was employed at the Hotel La Salle as manager.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that is just what I stated a minute ago. I stated that he was a hotel man, selected from Chicago.

Mr. HARRISON. We do not differ, then, so much.

Mr. CURTIS. I stated that, and he was there three weeks.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. That is not disputed.

Mr. HARRISON. We are getting together, then.

Mr. CURTIS. But what I want the Senator to know is that neither that man nor any other man in the Budget fixed the amount of any item in this appropriation bill. The total was requested to be reduced to a certain extent. The Budget notified the heads of the departments what the reductions must be, or what they would like to have them, and then the Budget officers in every department made the recommendations themselves to the Budget, and then the estimates came to the House of Representatives, where under the law they must be presented.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator agrees with me about this manager of the Hotel La Salle, then.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, I stated that, as the Senator would know if he had been listening. The difficulty with the Senator is that he makes statements and then does not listen to the answers.

Mr. HARRISON. The trouble is you never say anything.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it would be better for the Senate if other Senators said less.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the way with a reactionary Republican. He believes that. They want to slide something through here without the people getting onto it, but we have to let them know about it.

Now, getting back to this matter I was discussing, we are mighty near together. So last year this manager of the Hotel La Salle was appointed to go down to the Agricultural Department, and he did, and that is all I stated awhile ago. He went over the list, and he told them to cut the total over \$2,000,000. He was the man that had the Agricultural Department change its estimate. This year it is quite different. This manager of the Hotel La Salle was put on some other work. Evidently they found that he had bungled the estimates for the Agricultural Department last year and he was not the same man that was designated to go to the Agricultural Department this year.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for another statement, that shows that the Senator did not listen. The statement was made that General Dawes had asked business men from over the country to come here, volunteer their services, and study the estimates and the expenditures in the different departments. This man was not regularly employed in the Government service. He is not now and has not been, as I am advised, since that time.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, they ought to pay somebody and get a competent man, instead of allowing a manager of the Hotel La Salle to go down there and cut these estimates of the Department of Agriculture. I thought the fellow was on pay, a servant of the Government; and yet we find that General Dawes permitted a man who knew nothing about agriculture, who was to work for nothing, to go down there and cut the estimates. That is the system that we are called upon to accept; so there is not any difference between my good friend from Kansas and myself with respect to that matter.

I was going to read from the testimony to show that the manager of this hotel was the man delegated by the Bureau of the Budget to look over the Agricultural Department's estimates, and I am going to do it anyhow.

Senator HARRISON. Who had charge, on the part of the Director of the Budget, of the preparing of the estimates?

Doctor BALL—

He was representing the Department of Agriculture—

Doctor BALL. A gentleman whose name I can not at the moment remember—Stevens, I believe it was—the manager of the La Salle Hotel.

Senator HARRISON. Stevens?

Doctor BALL. Yes.

Senator HARRISON. He was the manager of the La Salle Hotel in Chicago?

Doctor BALL. The manager of the La Salle Hotel. He was also a director in General Dawes's bank, I believe.

Senator HARRISON. Was he an experienced farmer?

Doctor BALL. No; not at all.

Senator HARRISON. How long did he work on these estimates?

Doctor BALL. Probably about 10 days.

Senator HARRISON. Did he cut it throughout?

Doctor BALL. I never saw his exact figures, but about \$750,000.

Senator HARRISON. Was he the only one that worked on it on behalf of the Budget?

Doctor BALL. No; after he left he made his report to the Director of the Budget; and then General Mosley, who was the general assistant to General Dawes, went over the entire Budget again and made a further report.

Senator HARRISON. How much reduction did General Mosley make?

Doctor BALL. His reduction was the sum that I quoted.

Senator HARRISON. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars?

Doctor BALL. No; \$2,400,000, altogether.

Senator HARRISON. Why did General Mosley go over it after this other employee of the Director of the Budget had gone over it and checked it?

Doctor BALL. Because it had not reached the sum, I think, that was satisfactory to the Budget Bureau.

Senator HARRISON. But I understood you to say that this clerk at the Hotel La Salle—

Doctor BALL. He was the manager of the La Salle Hotel.

Senator HARRISON. This man who had been manager of the La Salle Hotel I understood you to say had made his report to the Director of the Budget, and in his report he had cut the estimate approximately \$750,000, and following that the director ordered General Mosley to go over it?

Senator OVERMAN. And cut it \$2,400,000.

Doctor BALL. Yes.

Senator HARRISON. And he cut it further?

Senator OVERMAN. No; he was instructed to go over it and cut it \$2,000,000, as I understood Doctor Ball to say yesterday.

There is the hearing on the proposition; and yet my good friend from Kansas becomes aroused here and disputes with me about a fact that finally we both agree about, and which the testimony shows we were both correct about.

Mr. President, my good friend from Kansas is one of the most adroit Senators I ever saw. I am sorry he is not here now. When we get to showing things up, and when the shoe begins to pinch, the Senator from Kansas seeks to divert us, as it is said that a bear, when pursued, will throw aside its young in order to escape and divert the attention of the pursuers. So, when I was proceeding to show how these various estimates for various lines of agricultural work had been cut by the Bureau of the Budget on the approval of the President, he tried to divert me from my line of talk, and brought up this Hotel La Salle manager.

I showed you the facts about the extension work. Let us take another matter. There is not anything that kills cattle quicker and is more injurious than a tick. They may not be indigenous to all sections of this country, but I know that in the section from which I come ticks sometimes infest the cattle, and they kill them, and work great injury and loss to the farmers of that section. So we must eradicate the tick, and heretofore we have carried in the appropriation bills very reasonable appropriations for that work. It was extended year by year, and so sections that once were infested by the tick have now become tick free, and these cattle, once tick ridden, now can be sent to market throughout this country, and it is due in large part to the splendid appropriations that have been made by the Congress for tick-eradication work; and yet what do we find in the bill now pending? The Agricultural Department recommended \$660,000, and the President approved what the Bureau of the Budget said was needed, and he says in his speech that is all they need. They cut the \$660,000 to \$500,000. Yes; they are economizing by lopping off \$160,000 of an appropriation that is necessary to rid the cattle of a certain section of this country of the tick, because they want through this Lasker bill to give that small amount over to the shipping trust of the country. Why, the way Lasker is managing things, that \$160,000 will not buy a stack for one of these boats that the Shipping Board has, and yet they are economizing with the great agricultural interests of the country!

That is not all. Let us consider the dairy industry. I do not know what the figures are. My friend the distinguished Senator from North Dakota might tell me; but I know that the dairy industry of this country is immense. It runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. It is confined to no section of the country. In some degree at least it pours wealth into the pockets of the farmers and the dairymen around the great city of New York and the great city of Philadelphia, the same as it does to the farmers out near Minneapolis and Chicago. All over the country we have a dairy interest, and we need it.

Experiments in the dairy industry have been undertaken by the Government ever since the Department of Agriculture was organized. The Government has been liberal in appropriations in the past to carry on experiment work for the dairy industry. Yet, under this administration, under this economizing spell, which catches the farmer and catches almost no one else, we find that for experiments in the dairy industry there was estimated by the Department of Agriculture \$375,000. The President in his budget recommends \$284,320 as all that is necessary, a cut of nearly \$100,000 against continuing the plans for experimentation in the great dairy industry of the country.

Let us go further than that. I did not know this thing was so big; I had no idea that the farmer had been treated so badly; I had no idea that this Congress and the President and the Budget Bureau would to such an extent disregard the necessities of the agricultural classes, until I began to look over this list to see where the knife of economy had cut the farmer; but it did not scratch any other industry in this country.

I need not call to the attention of the Senate how disastrous hog cholera is. When hogs get cholera they die like sheep, meaning millions of dollars of loss.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator mean like sheep with cholera?

Mr. HARRISON. No; the Senator from New York was writing a letter to some constituent, and he did not catch what I said. The cattle and the hogs and the sheep and all the stock would die if it were left to the nurturing hand of this administration to take care of the wants of agriculture.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator tell the Senate and the country how much better the Democratic administration took care of the wants of agriculture?

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad the Senator asked me that question. During the eight years that Wilson was President of this country there never came an appeal from the great West, or the North, or the South affecting the farmers' interests that he did not gladly heed and recommend to the Congress the passage of relief legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. Which party—

Mr. HARRISON. I have not finished answering the Senator. He asked me a question, and then does not want me to answer it. It takes me a long time to answer that question.

Mr. LENROOT. I observe that.

Mr. HARRISON. But I hope the Senator will be patient with me. The list of splendid achievements of the Wilson administration in behalf of the farmers of the country is so long that I hesitate to enter upon a discussion of it. I shall never forget when I came in as a Member in the Sixty-second Congress. At that time we were in the majority, and my friend from Wisconsin was then a Member of that august assembly, and a very live Member, too. He used to criticize everything that the majority wanted to do, and I know that in those days the influence of the distinguished Senator was hard for me to withstand. I sometimes feel like criticizing the majority myself, but I withhold my criticism—I have to restrain myself—but it was the habit the Senator from Wisconsin got into which almost led me astray when we got into the majority.

The Senator remembers that the first thing the Democratic Party did when we came into control of the House was in the interest of the farmers of the country. He has asked me the question, and I want him to listen to my answer. The first piece of legislation we championed was in the interest of the farmer; and yet he now asks me that question, as I parade this list of reductions in the appropriations for the agricultural interests before him. I know it makes him feel badly. I believe they did not know they treated the farmers as badly as they did, or they would not have done as they did by the passage of this bill.

The first legislation we passed was known as the farmers' free list bill. Before that the farmers had been compelled to buy their implements, buy the barbed wire for their fences, buy their gunny sacks, buy cloth in which to wrap their cotton, and buy 10,000 other things necessary to conduct a farm and the operation of the farm from the tariff-protected trusts. We removed the tariff from all those articles and placed them upon the free list. It was the first time in the history of this country that we had passed a tariff bill friendly to the great farming interests of the country.

We did not stop there. The next legislation we passed, as the Senator will recall, because he voted for it—and there were some others over there who voted for it—was to establish the Federal reserve banking system, when we wrote into the bill, with the help of the Senator from Wisconsin, the provision that allowed the member banks of the Federal reserve system to discount agricultural paper, the first time in all our history that the farmer had received an opportunity to discount his paper and get credit thereby.

We went down the list, passing what was known as the Lever agricultural extension act. I could enumerate piece after piece of legislation intended to promote the interests and welfare of the farmers enacted into the law during the Wilson administration, and never during the consideration of any agricultural appropriation bill were the estimates of the Agricultural Department cut below the needs of agriculture. Indeed, the Secretaries of Agriculture approved the estimates made by the experts from the Agricultural Department; they came to Congress, and committees and Congresses, dominated by a Democratic majority, passed them, giving to the great Department of Agriculture all that they needed and all that they could show was necessary.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Were those appropriations larger or smaller than the appropriations in the Agricultural appropriation bill just passed?

Mr. HARRISON. My recollection is that they were about the same as the appropriations in this one.

Mr. LENROOT. How does it happen, then, if this is such a discrimination against the farmer, with everything costing so much more now, that the Democratic Party did not make larger appropriations?

Mr. HARRISON. One of the reasons is that the barberry bush had not been discovered up in Wisconsin, and the demands would not come in from the Senator's State and Minnesota for some \$650,000 to eradicate the barberry. I can cite instance after instance where insects injurious to agriculture have been discovered since that time. That is what we make appropriations for, to enable the department to send men out to try to find such insects and pests and to get some solution for diseases which kill cattle and injure stock.

It is natural, as the population of the American Republic gradually increases, that the appropriations for agriculture should constantly be enlarged, and I am sure, with the logical mind of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, he would not assume for a minute that the Agricultural appropriation bill would gradually get smaller in amount, but he knows that if it keeps abreast of the times and takes care of the constant demands and needs of a great and growing country the appropriations will continue to increase within certain bounds.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator know that the bill we just passed carries out that very policy?

Mr. HARRISON. This bill carried \$200,000 less, if I recall the figures correctly, than the one we passed last year. I know the Budget cut the estimates. There is not much difference between them. I am not taking into account the appropriation carried for good roads.

Again I am diverted when I am proceeding in an orderly way. When the boot begins to pinch some Senator rises and tries to befuddle me so that I can not make my argument.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield? The Senator has been making a purely political speech here, and I hope he will welcome some facts.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator knows there is no politics in this.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me read the appropriations made for agriculture under the Democratic administration as compared with the Republican. In 1913 the Democratic Party appropriated for agriculture \$16,600,000; in 1914 they appropriated \$17,986,000; in 1915 they appropriated \$19,865,000; in 1916 they appropriated \$22,971,000; in 1917 they appropriated \$24,850,000; in 1918 they appropriated \$25,920,000. Then the Republicans came into power. In 1919 they appropriated \$27,887,000; in 1920 they appropriated \$33,899,000; in 1921 they appropriated \$31,712,000; and the bill just passed carries about \$33,000,000, more than double the appropriations made for agriculture by the Democratic Party when it came into power.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if there is anything in the world that would convince any man of ordinary common sense that the Democratic Party was a more economical party than the Republican Party, it is the statement just made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

I have shown that every estimate made by the Department of Agriculture for the needs of the farming interests of the country was immediately and adequately provided for in appropriations by a Democratic Congress. The appeals which came from the farmers were transmitted by the Agricultural Department to the Congress, and we gave them all they asked; yet we showed such magnificent economy in the management of the situation that the Senator himself cites figures which show the great saving to the American taxpayers when compared to the bill just passed.

Mr. LENROOT. Will not the Senator please make a statement which he himself believes? He certainly does not believe any such wild statement as he has just made regarding Democratic "economy." The word is not found in the Democratic dictionary.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, I knew the Senator would talk that way, but we think we did things pretty well. About the only fellows who have been indicted by this administration for malfeasance in office were Republicans who were appointed by the Democratic administration.

Mr. LENROOT. Not those appointed by Republicans.

Mr. HARRISON. That shows that the Department of Justice is very fair and is not playing politics, as my friend from Wisconsin is. I am trying to make a real, constructive, statesmanlike speech, and the Senator says I am talking politics. I have not investigated, for the purpose of comparison, the agricultural appropriations that were passed by the Democratic Congresses and those passed by the Republican Con-

gresses. I do know one fact which is fundamental, that we did take care of the needs of agriculture, and there was no politics in it. There has never been any politics in the appropriations for agriculture.

There is not any now. I am talking against the system here, if you please. I know that certain Senators on the other side of the Chamber are just as friendly to the farmers and want to take care of their needs as much as those on this side.

But I am trying to bring to the attention of those on the Republican side of the Chamber the fact that there is in force a system that works against the interests of the agriculturists of the country. There may have been provisions in agricultural appropriation bills carrying large amounts that were not wholly for agricultural purposes; I do not know. I know that in the present bill we provide large amounts for the Atlantic watershed, as I believe it is called. I know that we carry quite a large amount for roads in this bill—I think about thirty-odd million dollars.

Mr. McNARY. Twenty-nine million dollars, but that is not included—

Mr. HARRISON. I understand, but there are many things carried in the bill that are not wholly for agriculture. So it is natural that the amount carried in the bill as a whole should change year by year. The Senator knows that in the passing of the years the agricultural appropriations will constantly increase, as they should increase. So there is really nothing in the amount, but I do know the amount has been cut in this bill. The Budget did it and that is what I am calling to the attention of the Senate.

Now, let us go further. I was discussing plant diseases. When we think about the great peach and apple orchards, the pecan groves, and the orchards and groves of every kind in which we constantly find new insects and new diseases and new pests that the department never knew about before, we realize that we need appropriations to look immediately into the situation and to eradicate the pests and eliminate or cure the diseases. The Department of Agriculture of all departments should know what is needed to do that work. They estimated for \$182,000. What was given them? The Bureau of the Budget, whose action meets the approval of the President, gave only \$77,000. Thus it is that that important work will be curtailed to at least \$100,000. That is the way Republicans economize.

But that is not all. There is another provision for diseases of the orchard. The Agricultural Department estimated \$113,935 for that purpose. The Bureau of the Budget cut it to \$111,000. Thus it is that on the two items affecting diseases of the orchards the amounts have been cut \$125,000, not enough under Lasker's administration of the Shipping Board to purchase one plank to help repair one of the ships.

With reference to cotton diseases, Mr. President and Senators, if you knew of the horrible situation in the cotton-growing section of the country, if you knew what they have had to contend with, if you knew the effect on the industries of this country as well as the effect in other countries, you would not want to economize in an appropriation to eradicate or eliminate diseases and pests that are destructive of cotton. The boll weevil, that made its appearance some years ago, wrought millions, yea, I might say billions of dollars of damage to the cotton planters of the South, working so disastrously in my State that fields which had previously produced over a bale of cotton to the acre were so affected that they could not raise one-tenth of a bale of cotton to the acre, forcing the farmers to allow hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest cotton lands on God's green earth to lie idle. I have seen the destructive effects of it in my own State. I have seen it, where we once raised over a million bales of cotton a year, drop until we raised hardly half a million bales of cotton a year.

In the State of Georgia, represented in part by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from that State [Mr. GEORGE], where they once raised as much as two million bales, I believe, this year they estimate about 800,000 bales of cotton. I have seen the ravages of the boll weevil working its way through South Carolina, where they once raised 1,600,000 bales or more a year, and yet this year the Government estimate is that they will produce a little more than 500,000 bales. I have seen the pink boll weevil, as it came up from Mexico, working its injury in the boll of the cotton in Texas and on into Louisiana, destroying the prospects of the farmers and ravaging their fields. These things have caused the cotton crop to decrease until last year it had dropped to a little over 7,000,000 bales, and this year I think the Government estimate is 9,700,000 bales.

So, there will be in this country a shortage of cotton that can not be supplied to the world for at least two months of the

coming summer. They need the cotton. They need it to compete with the high prices of wool and other goods. They need it for the warmth of the American people as well as the people everywhere. Yet with that situation and condition, we see the estimates of the Agricultural Department, desired to fight the cotton diseases, cut from \$127,000 down to \$117,000.

Now, let us see what else. Here is an item for crop plants. Land that once produced nothing has, under the magic hand of some progressive truck farmer, been brought to produce truck crops that fill the wants of the great cities of the country with cheap cabbage, cheap tomatoes, and cheap vegetables of every kind. Diseases have worked their way into those crops and very often destroyed them. As the crop is affected by a pest or an insect or a disease, so is the price of that particular vegetable or commodity increased to the American consumer. In this day and time, when the high cost of living has soared so that the American people can hardly make ends meet, I wonder how the man of family on a small salary can get along at all. God knows I do not see how he can exist with things as high as they are.

All these economic conditions and questions should be taken into consideration in making up an appropriation bill affecting the great agricultural interests of the country, and yet, with vegetables and other necessities of life needed in the great cities of the country, we see the estimates of the Agricultural Department for the work on crop plants reduced from \$66,860 to the pitiful sum of \$55,000.

Now, what would \$11,000 do in maintaining the proposed subsidized merchant marine? How far would it go in promoting the Lasker scheme for a ship subsidy? It would help very materially the farmers of the country who are affected by the different diseases in their truck crops, and yet the Congress says, with the President's approval, "We will withhold that \$11,000; we will not give it to stamp out disease in truck crops, but we will give it over to the great shipping interests of the country, because they need it." That is the Republican idea of the way the Government should be run.

God bless you, you Republicans will have a lot to answer for when you get away from here on the 4th of March. You Republicans did not consider the force of the suggestion I made this morning. If you would go ahead and have the President call an extra session of Congress, we could stay here all this spring and summer fighting out the ship subsidy bill, and you would have a good excuse for not going back home to face your people. The people could not see you then. It is going to be mighty hard for some of you to face your constituents after the 4th of March. You will wish then that you had followed my suggestion about an extra session of Congress.

What explanation are you going to make to the man who raises a little truck crop, say, some lettuce that he must cover up at night with cloth, where he must build fires around the hotbeds and coldframes in order to keep the lettuce warm, so that the wintry winds and cold blasts from the north will not destroy it. The man who has planted his tomatoes out in the field, where they seem to be growing nicely under the kiss of the spring sun, hears the squeedunk blowing. It can be heard for miles and miles. Then one farmer says to the other, "What is that?"

There the farmer says, "That is the warning. That is the squeedunk over yonder that is blowing. They have a report from Washington, and the report is that a cold wave is coming." Then the farmers begin to go out in the field and cover up tomato plants or other vegetables. They work late into the night. They build fires to create warmth to ward off the wintry blast. But the cold comes and their crops are destroyed.

Those men undergo all the vicissitudes of a changing climate. They have to fight everything, with no great insurance companies to write a policy insuring that their crop will come out 100 per cent. There is no insurance company to underwrite a policy that they will be protected against cold or disease or insect or injurious pest. The only help they have is not the happy hopefulness of the President—no; not that, but they have the hope that here in Washington, where they have two Senators and a Congressman, they will be able to pass an appropriation bill every year which will in a small way make allowance for taking care of their crops, providing a little appropriation to fight the diseases which infest truck crops. And yet when you go home and meet that little truck farmer you will have to explain to him why you and your President reduced the Department of Agriculture estimate from \$66,860 to \$55,000. If you think that you can give him an excuse to justify the proposition that that was needed in the ship subsidy appropriation, just try it out on him. That is what you are trying to do here. Here I have brought upon my head censure from the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] because I would have the Senate wait until next

Tuesday to pass the agricultural credits bill. He wants to whip it through here by to-morrow night; he only wants 10 minutes to be allowed for the discussion of each amendment. I can not believe that he does not want the bill "framed" after full and adequate consideration; but it is because he is so anxious and other Senators on the majority side of the Chamber are so anxious to force the ship subsidy bill upon the American people. I can not believe that Senators on the other side knew when they voted to reduce the appropriation for investigating and improving truck crops and to fight diseases and pests and insects affecting such crops \$11,000 that they really intended for the money merely to go to the shipping trust; and yet that is what their actions here mean if we allow the ship subsidy bill to pass.

Mr. President, I will refer to two other items. One is for the improvement of cereals. Is there anything that we should work more diligent upon than to try to improve the quality and increase the production of cereals in this country? Is there anything that could be brought more directly to the home life, to the fireside, to the breakfast table, and to the dinner table than to improve the quality as well as increase production of cereals?

The Agricultural Department through years have been prosecuting this work, and they have performed a great service. This year the Agricultural Department's estimate for this work was \$42,440. Yet the President of the United States approves the estimate of the Budget Bureau and Congress approves it, reducing the amount to \$32,000. There is an instance where cereal improvement can wait, but the shipping interests must be taken care of. It is argued that, though it is a small amount, it will help some.

The Agricultural Department estimated \$180,000 for the improvement of crop production, but the Budget Bureau cut it to \$169,000. Again the farmers of the country are economized upon.

For horticultural investigations the Agricultural Department estimated \$79,440, but the Budget Bureau estimates bring it down to \$71,940.

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire list, though I could cite other instances to the Senate. However, it does no good here. I talk, and I plead, but it seems that Senators on the other side of the Chamber are callous to any suggestions I make or to any appeal which I may utter.

Worse than all—and we are now about to vote—the Senator from Oregon makes a motion here which will put the finishing touches to this conference report. I procured—and I thank the Senate for it—an increased appropriation, against the suggestions of the Budget Bureau, of \$50,000 for the destruction of the sweet-potato weevil. I thought it was necessary; indeed, I know it would have been most helpful to the section from which I come. The sweet-potato crop in five States along the Gulf coast is valued at \$135,000,000.

Under this appropriation in the last few years we have been able to eliminate the sweet-potato weevil in many of the counties and in some of those States, but it is a pest which, unless we shall continue every effort to restrain its march, will go on from State to State and enlarge the field of its operations. I am quite sure that the inadequate appropriation carried in this bill will mean millions of dollars of injury to the farmers who must combat the sweet-potato weevil; but I have done my best; I can do no more. Under our system of Government, under the peculiar method in which we pass legislation through Congress, I know that no matter how long I might speak and what I might say I could not defeat, indeed, I would not defeat, the report carrying the appropriations for agriculture in this country. There are so many good provisions in the legislation; so many necessary provisions in the bill that I, of course, would not attempt to defeat the conference report merely because the Senate conferees receded on my amendment.

I shall not say, for some one might imagine the discussion to be sectional, that it is peculiarly strange that the appropriation for the corn borer which was increased by amendment in the Senate was retained in the bill. The corn borer has ravaged the corn fields of New England; it has greatly affected the corn crop in that section. I believe that the amount appropriated for its destruction, which includes the increased amount which the Senate provided, is necessary in order to fight the corn borer, and I would not say anything against it for fear that what I should say might be misinterpreted; but the increase in the appropriation to combat the sweet-potato weevil was eliminated, while the amendment increasing the appropriation to combat the corn borer was retained.

I would not say anything as to other amendments increasing appropriations over those recommended by the committee,

notably the one to exterminate the barberry bush. I shall bide my time with patience, hoping that next year, when the Agricultural appropriation bill shall again be under consideration, and the Senate committee considers it, care will be taken to provide an adequate appropriation for the destruction of the sweet-potato weevil.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Gooding | McKellar | Shortridge |
| Ball | Hale | McLean | Spencer |
| Brookhart | Harris | McNary | Stanfield |
| Bursum | Harrison | Nelson | Sterling |
| Calder | Heflin | New | Sutherland |
| Cameron | Johnson | Nicholson | Swanson |
| Capper | Jones, Wash. | Norbeck | Trammell |
| Caraway | Kellogg | Norris | Underwood |
| Colt | Kendrick | Oddie | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | King | Overman | Walsh, Mass. |
| Ernst | Ladd | Page | Walsh, Mont. |
| Fernald | Lenroot | Phipps | Watson |
| Fletcher | Lodge | Pomerene | |
| George | McCormick | Reed, Pa. | |
| Glass | McCumber | Shields | |

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] are detained from the Senate because of their duties in connection with the work of conference committees on appropriation bills.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. WILLIS] because of serious illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the absence from the Chamber of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on account of the oil hearings before the Committee on Manufactures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let us have the motion stated. We may want to divide the question, if it can be divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The motion pertains to the message from the House, and is that the Senate agree to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 11, 31, 33, and 35, and recede from its amendment numbered 34.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Oregon what disposition was made by the conferees of the appropriation of \$6,000,000 plus for roads and trails in Government forests?

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Utah that we arrived at a disagreement. That was one of the items presented here to-day for either confirmation or instructions to insist upon the Senate amendment. I am informed that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] will make a motion at this time that the conferees insist upon making the whole amount, namely, \$6,500,000, immediately available for the construction of forest roads, rather than the House provision that only \$3,000,000 shall be made immediately available.

Mr. KING. As I understand, if I may be pardoned, the House appropriated \$6,000,000 directly—

Mr. McNARY. Six million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Six million five hundred thousand dollars, to be immediately available, for roads and trails within the national forests.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. KING. The conferees have abandoned that, and have agreed upon \$3,000,000 to be immediately available, and power is given the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts for the expenditure of the other \$3,500,000.

Mr. McNARY. The action of the Senate was to the effect that \$6,500,000 should be immediately available. In conference we disagreed, and the House comes back with this provision making \$3,000,000 immediately available, \$3,500,000 to be carried in a deficiency bill, and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate among the States the \$3,500,000 not made available; also to contract with respect to it. That is not satisfactory to some of those who are interested in the roads in national forests, and the Senator from Arizona intends to make his motion at this time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I just want to correct one impression that the Senator from Utah apparently has. The House did not appropriate \$6,500,000 and make it immediately available.

Mr. KING. No; \$3,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Three million dollars; and the Senate appropriated \$6,500,000 and made it immediately available.

Mr. KING. If I indicated as the Senator states, I did not intend to convey that impression.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and ask for a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, for this reason:

There are 29 States that have a large forest area. There has been withdrawn in these 29 States a forest area of 156,837,282 acres of the public domain. That area is not taxable at this time. In order to make the Forest Service self-sustaining or in order to derive from the Forest Service the benefits that the Government ought to derive these areas should be properly taken care of in the way of development. Roads and plenty of them should be built, thus tapping the timber belts and other natural resources which are now of little use and hardly appreciated. Under the appropriation of June 19, 1922, section 2 and section 4, we are entitled under that bill this year to \$6,500,000. The House saw fit to cut the \$6,500,000 to \$3,000,000. The Senate committee put it back to the original amount \$6,500,000, and the conferees stood up for the \$6,500,000. It is necessary now, in order to get this \$6,500,000, to disagree to the House amendment, and I ask the Senate, after a most careful consideration of this appropriation and close study of the situation, to send this amendment back for a further conference. That is the reason of my motion at this time, and I hope the Senate will see the great public need of this full appropriation so these forest areas can be properly developed as now outlined through the program of the forestry department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to inquire of him what was the recommendation of the Budget with respect to the item for roads within the national forests?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I can answer that question, with the Senator's permission. The Bureau of the Budget recommended an authorization of \$6,500,000, due to a past act authorizing the appropriation of that sum of money, but making immediately available \$3,000,000. The act passed some years ago, when the road work was in the hands of the Post Office Department, authorizing the appropriation of \$6,500,000 for this year. This legislation is in fulfillment of that authorization, passed in 1921, and as brought to the House it was in response to the estimate of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I think I understand the Senator. He spoke of "this year." Did he refer to the fiscal year 1924?

Mr. McNARY. The year commencing 1923, to 1924.

Mr. KING. That is, beginning with the 1st of July, 1923, and ending with the 30th of June, 1924?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; that is it.

Mr. KING. Was there any antecedent legislation that restricted the Congress of the United States to an appropriation of only \$6,500,000 for roads and trails in the national forests?

Mr. McNARY. A bill was passed in 1921 providing for the expenditure of certain sums in the national forests in the years 1923, 1924, and 1925. The \$6,500,000 was the amount authorized to be expended in 1923-24; and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, of course, could not go back of the authorization that had been sanctioned by prior statutes, but made available \$3,000,000 upon the theory that that was all the money they could use, but that they had a right to contract for the balance, namely, \$3,500,000.

Mr. KING. Then he was acting upon the assumption that those who were charged with the duty of expending the entire amount could not advantageously contract for and expend this \$6,500,000 for roads and bridges and trails in the national forests in the space of 12 months?

Mr. McNARY. I will not say that. It was uncertain, perhaps, whether or not they could expend all the sums; but the point was simply this: A great many of those interested in the roads in national forests wanted the whole amount—namely, \$6,500,000—made immediately available, so that these small contractors would feel justified in entering into contracts, knowing thereby that they would receive their money and could get the proper credits at the banks. That was the position of the Senate conferees. The House conferees, however, argued that if they made \$3,000,000 available the balance could be carried in the deficiency bill, as it was subject to contract rights. As a compromise, the House proposed to make immediately available the \$3,000,000, and to specify that the Secretary of Agriculture can contract for the balance of the \$3,500,000, and also to direct him to allot among the various States the remain-

ing sum of \$3,500,000. That is not satisfactory to some of those interested in the forest roads, and that is the reason of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KING. It seems to me the Senator from Arizona is entirely right. He is fortified by the law, fortified by common sense, and fortified, it seems to me, by legitimate and wisely accepted business policies. If we are to construct these roads, the men charged with the responsibility know best how to expend the money, and the very reason suggested by the Senator from Oregon—namely, that the small contractors want to know that they can get their money when they enter into their contracts and when they do the work, without having to wait for subsequent appropriations—would justify, and not only justify, but, it seems to me, demand that the Senate adhere to the position it took when it made immediately available the \$6,500,000.

I shall be very glad, therefore, to support the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. May I inquire what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the pending question.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The motion made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] was that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 11, 31, 33, and 35, and recede from its amendment No. 34. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] has now moved that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 33, and insist upon its own amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. I submit, merely as a matter of parliamentary procedure, that the motion of the Senator from Arizona is not in order until the pending motion of the Senator from Oregon is disposed of, a motion to agree being preferential over a motion to disagree, it bringing the two Houses together on the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin if his position is that the question can not be divided?

Mr. LENROOT. No; we can divide the question and vote upon the motion to agree, but of course voting it down would be equivalent to disagreeing; but a motion to disagree, as the Senator well knows, is not preferential over a motion to agree.

Mr. KING. The Senator insists that the proper parliamentary procedure would be to agree or to disagree to the report of the conferees?

Mr. LENROOT. If there is a motion pending to agree, that has preference, of course.

Mr. KING. And if we should vote to agree, being satisfied with all the residue of the report, that would cut off the item that is under consideration now and prevent the matter being sent back to conference?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly; but a separate vote can be had upon this particular item, of course.

Mr. KING. That is what I had reference to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I do not want to stand in the way of the Senator from Arizona having a free expression of the Senate upon his amendment; and I should like to know, if I should withdraw the motion that I have made, whether the motion of the Senator from Arizona would be in order?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he modify his motion so as to move to agree to all of the amendments that he desires to agree to, except the one in question, and that will leave the matter open for the Senator from Arizona to make his motion.

Mr. McNARY. I think that would be preferable.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In other words, it is proposed to strike from the original motion the numerals "33."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to say just one word about the motion to recede from the amendment No. 34. I have examined the debate in the House, and I am satisfied from the situation there that it would be utterly useless to send that amendment back to conference. Therefore I shall vote for the motion to recede.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon, leaving out amendment numbered 33.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before that motion is voted upon I shall be glad to learn from the Senator from Oregon what the other items are and exactly what will be the result of the affirmative vote for which the Senator now asks.

Mr. McNARY. One appertains to the provision of maximum salaries of the scientific employees of the Secretary of Agriculture. The only difference between the Senate amendment

and the action of the House is that the Senate inserted the word "hereafter," making it permanent law. The House has modified it to make it apply during the fiscal year 1924. The other is simply a reenactment of the provision, now extant in the statute, permitting the shipment from a State where lumber is cut to some other State in the Union. The other is the recession from the seed item and the bean item.

Mr. KING. Respecting the timber item to which the Senator refers, as I understand the Senator, if the amendment agreed upon in this report prevails, then timber which is cut from forests by permission may be transported from one State to another?

Mr. McNARY. Yes. In the old law there is a prohibition against cutting timber in one State and shipping it to another, upon the theory that the State where it is cut should have the use of the timber for its consumption. That was found to be impracticable, and timber cut on the public lands, or in the national forests of Utah, under this provision could be shipped to another State.

Mr. KING. That is a very wise provision, because the Senator knows that there are many instances where the timber cut near some boundary line between two States is not available at all in the State in which the timber is growing, and is only available across the line in some other State. The Senate recently passed a bill permitting the exportation to Utah or other States of timber cut upon the reserves in Arizona, for instance, because in the Arizona strip, as it is called, there are few, if any, inhabitants, and the timber there is of no value whatever. I am very glad of the position of the Senate upon that item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona now moves that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, that the Senate insist upon its amendment and ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing vote thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ACTION ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in the Sixty-sixth Congress the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows, to wit:

"ARTICLE V.

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution when ratified within six years from the date of their proposal by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, or by the electors in three-fourths thereof, as the mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

This amendment was reported favorably from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

We have had 19 amendments to the Federal Constitution. I will treat the first 10 amendments as a part and parcel of the original Constitution, because when the Constitution was ratified it was upon the distinctly implied, in some cases expressed, understanding that amendments would be adopted. They were proposed and submitted by the First Congress on the 15th of September, 1789. They were 12 in number. The third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth were ratified by the required number of States within exactly two years and three months. But No. 1 and No. 2 are still pending, and on the 15th day of next September will have been pending 134 years.

So we perceive a wise suggestion in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut that there should be a time limit. Moreover, we have precedent. Congress, in submitting the prohibition amendment, laid a limit upon the time within which the States could ratify.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the last nine amendments have been brought about by "amendment periods." The eleventh and twelfth amendments were adopted in the 10-year period between 1794 and 1804, the twelfth having been brought about by the unfortunate tie in the Electoral

College between Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr. Call that the first amendment period. Then, notwithstanding the fact that many scores of amendments were introduced in Congress and two were proposed between 1804 and 1864, no amendment was adopted; thus there was a 60-year period of immobility with respect to amending our Federal Constitution.

Then came the second amendment period, which began in 1865 and lasted until 1875. In that 10-year period the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments were proposed and adopted.

Then came another period of nearly 40 years of immobility, and then came the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth amendments—the third amendment period, 1909 to 1923—showing that these amendments move in cycles.

The Federal Constitution conserves and protects all that real Americans hold precious; it should not be changed by legislative caucus but by the direct vote of the people.

There is not a State in the Federal Union whose constitution may be amended by the State legislature. The various State constitutions may be amended only by the electorate of the State. How utterly archaic, therefore, it is to deny the electorate an opportunity to express itself upon the proposed change in our fundamental law.

If the consent of the voters be required to alter and amend a State constitution, a fortiori the vote of the people should be required to change the Federal Constitution.

It is vital to our American system that the voter should have an opportunity to say at the ballot box what form of government he desires to live under.

If you are not willing that the State legislatures should choose United States Senators, for a much stronger reason the State legislatures should not change your fundamental law.

Every argument in favor of the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people is a stronger argument in favor of consulting the people on constitutional amendments.

I favored the amendments providing for the income tax, direct election of Senators, prohibition, and woman suffrage. I believe they were wise amendments, and that they were in response to the deliberate judgment and progressive thought of a vast majority of our countrymen; indeed, I believe those amendments were demanded by the people and were not forced upon the people. My belief, unfortunately, does not settle the question, for the stubborn fact exists that millions of our countrymen thoroughly believe that the prohibition and woman-suffrage amendments were adopted by cunning, by craftiness and indirection, and that the Congress and the State legislatures were either browbeaten into voting for the amendments or were induced to do so by an insidious lobby. It is my opinion that if a referendum to the people on the prohibition and woman-suffrage amendments could have been had, each amendment would have been adopted and ratified by the electors. We should, therefore, take the requisite steps to preclude the opportunity in the future of a recurrence of such discontent and suspicion by providing a means by which the electors of each State may pass upon amendments to the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 Members of the Senate, in all 531. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, as a part of my remarks, a statement showing the number of State senators, number of members of the house or assembly, as the case may be, in the State legislatures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Number of members in State legislatures according to the year 1919.

| State. | Senate. | House or assembly. |
|--------------------|---------|--------------------|
| Alabama..... | 35 | 106 |
| Arizona..... | 19 | 35 |
| Arkansas..... | 35 | 109 |
| California..... | 40 | 80 |
| Colorado..... | 35 | 60 |
| Connecticut..... | 35 | 258 |
| Delaware..... | 17 | 35 |
| Florida..... | 32 | 75 |
| Georgia..... | 44 | 159 |
| Idaho..... | 37 | 65 |
| Illinois..... | 51 | 152 |
| Indiana..... | 59 | 100 |
| Iowa..... | 50 | 108 |
| Kansas..... | 40 | 125 |
| Kentucky..... | 38 | 100 |
| Louisiana..... | 41 | 115 |
| Maine..... | 31 | 151 |
| Maryland..... | 27 | 102 |
| Massachusetts..... | 49 | 240 |
| Michigan..... | 32 | 100 |

Number of members in State legislatures, etc.—Continued.

| State. | Senate. | House or assembly. |
|---------------------|---------|--------------------|
| Minnesota..... | 67 | 130 |
| Mississippi..... | 49 | 133 |
| Missouri..... | 34 | 142 |
| Montana..... | 41 | 95 |
| Nebraska..... | 33 | 100 |
| Nevada..... | 17 | 37 |
| New Hampshire..... | 24 | 404 |
| New Jersey..... | 21 | 60 |
| New Mexico..... | 24 | 49 |
| New York..... | 51 | 159 |
| North Carolina..... | 50 | 120 |
| North Dakota..... | 49 | 113 |
| Ohio..... | 38 | 128 |
| Oklahoma..... | 44 | 111 |
| Oregon..... | 30 | 60 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 59 | 207 |
| Rhode Island..... | 30 | 100 |
| South Carolina..... | 44 | 124 |
| South Dakota..... | 45 | 103 |
| Tennessee..... | 33 | 99 |
| Texas..... | 31 | 142 |
| Utah..... | 18 | 46 |
| Vermont..... | 30 | 246 |
| Virginia..... | 40 | 100 |
| Washington..... | 41 | 97 |
| West Virginia..... | 30 | 94 |
| Wisconsin..... | 33 | 100 |
| Wyoming..... | 27 | 57 |
| | 1,760 | 5,643 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| Members of senate..... | 1,760 |
| Members of houses of assembly..... | 5,643 |
| Total..... | 7,403 |

Mr. ASHURST. So we have a total of 7,403 members of the State legislatures, according to the figures for the year 1919. Not two-thirds but a bare majority of that 7,400 men may pass upon an amendment to the Constitution.

We find ourselves in this posture: Two-thirds of the Congress and a majority of the 7,400, or about 4,500 men, pass upon the destiny of the most advanced people that ever lived in the tide of time. We set ourselves up as the leader among the nations in thought and as responsive to the people's will, and yet 4,500 men, if they saw fit, could Prussianize the Republic.

Mr. President, it is startling to investigate and then reflect upon the perils that have come and that in the future may come by a continued failure to set a time limit within which a proposed amendment may be ratified.

Four different amendments duly proposed by the Congress are now pending before the States for their action. These amendments are as follows:

One, proposed September 15, 1789, 134 years ago, relating to enumeration and representation:

ARTICLE I. After the first enumeration required by the first article of the Constitution there shall be one Representative for every 30,000 until the number shall amount to 100, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall be not less than 100 Representatives, nor less than one Representative for every 40,000 persons, until the number of Representatives shall amount to 200, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall not be less than 200 Representatives, nor more than one Representative for every 50,000 persons.

Another, proposed September 15, 1789, 134 years ago, relating to compensation of Members of Congress:

ART. 2. No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

Another, proposed May 1, 1810—113 years ago—to prohibit citizens of the United States from accepting presents, pensions, or titles from princes or from foreign powers:

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.

Another, proposed March 2, 1861—62 years ago—known as the Corwin amendment, prohibiting Congress from interfering with slavery within the States:

No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State. (12 Stat. 251.)

I think the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] took a bold and progressive step recently when he introduced his proposed constitutional amendment granting to the people the right to vote upon amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator mentioned a moment ago the ratification of the Constitution in the early days. I ask for information. My recollection is that most of the legislatures of the 13 Colonies—or many of them, at least—were elected with reference to the Constitution, so that the people had the right to choose—

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct. Conventions in most instances were called and the question submitted was the ratification of the convention of 1787. In the case of Virginia I presume that never on this continent has there been assembled in one State more learning and wisdom than was assembled in the Virginia convention which ratified the Federal Constitution, and after a debate which lasted many days and was participated in by the leading statesmen of Virginia the Federal Constitution was ratified by 10 majority.

On September 15, 1789, 12 constitutional amendments were proposed by the First Congress. The requisite number of States ratified proposed articles numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 within exactly two years and three months, whilst Nos. 1 and 2, although proposed 134 years ago, have not, according to the latest available returns, received favorable action by the requisite number of States and are yet before the American people, or the States, rather, have been for 134 years, and are now subject to ratification or rejection by the States. After those two proposed amendments, to wit, Nos. 1 and 2, had been in nubilus—"in the clouds"—for 84 years, the Ohio State Senate in 1873, in response to a tide of indignation that swept over the land in opposition to the so-called "back-salary grab," resurrected proposed amendment No. 2 and passed a resolution of ratification through the State senate. No criticism can be visited upon the Ohio Legislature that attempted to ratify the amendment proposed in 1789, and if the amendment had been freshly proposed by Congress at the time of the "back-salary grab" instead of having been drawn forth from musty tomes, where it had so long lain idle, stale, and dormant, other States doubtless would have ratified it during the period from 1873 to 1881.

Thus it would seem that a period of 134 years, or 84 years, within which a State may act is altogether too long, and I will support a proposition limiting the time to 6, 8, or 10 years within which a State may act under a particular submission, so that we will not hand down to posterity a conglomerate mass of amendments floating around in a cloudy, nebulous haze, which a State here may resurrect and ratify and a State there may galvanize and ratify.

We ought to have homogeneous, steady, united exertion, and certainly we should have contemporaneous action with reference to these various proposed amendments. Judgment on the case should be rendered within the ordinary lifetime of those interested in bringing about the change in our fundamental law. Final action should be had while the discussions and arguments are within the remembrance of those who are called upon to act.

There is still another reason why a time limit should be set: When the 12 amendments were submitted in 1789 there were only 13 States. Vermont had not been admitted, if I remember correctly.

Question: Should three-fourths of the States then in the Union or three-fourths of those now in the Union be the test as to what shall be the number required for ratification?

The amendment proposed on May 1, 1810, was submitted to the States under the most interesting and peculiar auspices that ever came before a legislative body, and was as follows:

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.

What was the reason for that proposed amendment? History does not disclose, but the reason was that when officials accept presents of great value they dissolve the pearl of independence in the vinegar of obligation.

Unfortunately, the annals of Congress and contemporary newspapers do not give any of the debate upon this interesting proposition. The only light thrown upon the subject by the annals is the remark of Mr. Macon, who said "he considered the vote on this question as deciding whether or not we were to have members of the Legion of Honor in this country." What event connected with our diplomatic or political history suggested the need of such an amendment is not now apparent,

but it is possible that the presence of Jerome Bonaparte in this country a few years previous, and his marriage to a Maryland lady, may have suggested this measure.

An article in Niles's Register (vol. 72, p. 166), written many years after this event, refers to an amendment having been adopted to prevent any but native-born citizens from being President of the United States. This is, of course, a mistake, as the Constitution in its original form contained such a provision; but it may be possible that the circumstances referred to by the writer in Niles relate to the passage of this amendment through Congress in regard to titles of nobility. The article referred to maintains that at the time Jerome Bonaparte was in this country the Federalist Party, as a political trick, affecting to apprehend that Jerome might find his way to the Presidency through "French influence," proposed the amendment. The Federalists thought the Democratic Party would oppose it as unnecessary, which would thus appear to the public as a further proof of their subservience to French influence. The Democrats, to avoid this imputation, concluded to carry the amendment. "It can do no harm" was what reconciled it to all.

That amendment was submitted 113 years ago, and it was ratified within two years by Maryland, Kentucky, Ohio, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Vermont, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. It was rejected by two or three of the States. At one period of our national life the school-book histories and the public men stated that it was a part of our organic law, because in the early days of our Government the Secretary of State did not send messages to Congress announcing ratification or promulgate to the public any notice whatever as to when an amendment became a part of the Constitution. I have caused the journals, records, and files in the Department of State to be searched, and there may not be found any notice of any proclamation or promulgation of the ratification of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. The States assumed—it was not an unwarranted or violent assumption—that when the requisite number of States had ratified an amendment it was then and there a part of our organic law.

When the War between the States began to throw its shadow over the land, men rushed here and there with a compromise to heal the breach, if possible, and tried to avert the shock that was apparently about to come to our governmental structure. Expedient after expedient was proposed, and just before the adjournment of Congress—to wit, on March 2, 1861—the following amendment, known as the Corwin amendment, to the Constitution of the United States was proposed to the States, and it read as follows:

No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State. (12 Stat. 251.) Proposed by Congress March 2, 1861.

That amendment was proposed by Congress on the 2d of March, 1861, and I warrant there are not 5,000 people in the United States to-day who know that such an amendment is now pending before the various States of the Union for their ratification. The amendment was ratified by the State of Ohio and by the State of Maryland through their legislatures and by the State of Illinois in 1862 by a convention.

Thus we perceive that a system which permits of no limitation as to the time when an amendment may not be voted upon by the State is not fair to posterity nor to the present generation. It keeps historians, publishers, and annalists, as well as the general public, constantly in doubt.

Having searched closely as to whether there is in the Constitution itself any expressed or implied limitations as to when an amendment may not be adopted, I am driven irresistibly to the conclusion that an amendment to the Constitution, once having been duly proposed, although proposed September 15, 1789, could not be recalled even by the unanimous vote of both Houses, if the Congress wished the same recalled, because the power to submit an amendment is specifically pointed out; but no power is given to recall it, and silence is negation.

I am not without authority on this subject, and I shall include in the Record some data I have collected on this subject.

Along this line, though it may be academic, I think it ought to go in the record, when an amendment is once submitted Congress has no power to recall it. Congress obtains its power solely from the Constitution. There is power to submit, but no power to recall. Hence, I reach the conclusion, and I believe it is a logical, inevitable conclusion, that those amendments which were submitted so long ago are still pending. If defeated, when were they defeated? They are still

pending. But in respect to a State, the State may ratify an amendment and recall that ratification if before its final ratification the required number of States have not ratified.

That is in grave doubt. Many Senators and a great many others dispute the right of a State, after it has ratified, to withdraw its ratification. But I think the best opinion, the most matured thought, is that a State has a right to withdraw its ratification, provided the required number of States have not theretofore ratified, and provided further that the action of the State withdrawing the ratification does not change the result. Of course, after a State legislature has rejected a ratification, it may the next day or the next week or at any other time vote again; it may vote every day if it wishes; that is entirely within the discretion of the State legislature. But I notice that the amendment proposed by the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] proposes to clear away that doubt, and I think that is wise. It proposes in terms that the State shall have the right to withdraw its assent at any time before the required number have ratified. Am I correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. In other words, the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York would clear away that doubt and statesmen and others would be no longer in doubt as to whether a State could or could not withdraw its assent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask if he has noted the comparatively recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to the action of the Legislature of Ohio and of the people of Ohio who voted at a popular referendum on one of the recently submitted amendments. My recollection is, and I will stand corrected if I am mistaken, that the Legislature of Ohio, when it had submitted to it one of the last two amendments proposed, ratified it, although at that moment there was pending before the people of Ohio a referendum on the same subject. The people of Ohio voted down the proposal which the legislature had ratified. It was part of the law of Ohio that a matter of that sort could be submitted by the legislature to the people for a direct vote. The Supreme Court held, however, that the referendum held under the laws and constitution of the State of Ohio had no force and effect and that, the legislature itself first having ratified, that constituted a legal ratification, thereby the will of the people being absolutely thwarted and ignored.

Mr. ASHURST. I recall that circumstance. In other words, no matter if the State of Ohio or of New York or any other State should at the polls unanimously reject a proposed amendment, if the legislature should ratify it by a bare majority of one in each house, that would be a constitutional ratification, because it is beyond the power of the State now to ratify a constitutional amendment other than by the method provided in the Constitution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I understand, the Supreme Court holds that the term "legislature," as contained in the article of the Constitution providing for amendments, means the legislative body elected by the people of the State.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The most restricted possible definition.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And we can not include the people of a State as a part of the legislative machinery.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is entirely correct. If a State should abolish its legislature and resort to what we call the initiative to initiate laws and the referendum to pass upon them later, that State before it would be an eligible entity to pass upon an amendment to the Federal Constitution would have to set up some chosen body of men called its "legislature"; otherwise it would be impotent and powerless to pass upon a constitutional amendment.

At this juncture, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record some copious data on this subject showing by what vote and when the various constitutional amendments were ratified. It will not take over half a column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DISCUSSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED.
(Jameson.)

SEC. 585. VI. Two further questions may be considered: (1) When Congress has submitted amendments to the States, can it recall them? and (2) How long are amendments thus submitted open to adoption or rejection by the States?

1. The first question must, we think, receive a negative answer. When Congress has submitted amendments, at the time deemed by itself or its constituents desirable, to concede to that body the power of afterwards recalling them would be to give to it that of definitely rejecting such amendments, since the recall would withdraw them from

the consideration of the States and thus render their adoption impossible. However this may be, it is enough to justify a negative answer to say that the Federal Constitution, from which alone Congress derives its power to submit amendments to the States, does not provide for recalling them upon any event or condition, and that the power to recall can not be considered as involved in that to submit as necessary to its complete execution. It therefore can not exist.

2. The same consideration will, perhaps, furnish the answer to the second question. The Constitution gives to Congress the power to submit amendments to the States; that is, either to the State legislatures or to conventions called by the States for this purpose, but there it stops. No power is granted to prescribe conditions as to the time within which the amendments are to be ratified, and hence to do so would be to transcend the power given. The practice of Congress in such cases has always conformed to the implied limitations of the Constitution. It has contented itself with proposing amendments, to become valid as parts of the Constitution, according to the terms of that instrument. It is therefore possible, though hardly probable, that an amendment once proposed is always open to adoption by the nonacting or nonratifying States.

The better opinion would seem to be that an alteration of the Constitution proposed to-day has relation to the sentiment and the felt needs of to-day, and that, if not ratified early, while that sentiment may fairly be supposed to exist, it ought to be regarded as waived and not again to be voted upon unless a second time proposed by Congress.

SEC. 586. In discussing the question of the right of the States to vote upon proposed amendments at any time after the date of their proposal it is proper to look into the consequences of such a right. If they have the right, there are now floating about us, as it were, in nebulous, several amendments to the Constitution proposed by Congress which have received the ratification of one or more States but not of enough to make them valid as parts of that instrument. Congress could not withdraw them, and there is in force in regard to them no recognized statute of limitations. Unless abrogated by amendments subsequently adopted, they are, on the hypothesis stated, still before the American people to be adopted or rejected.

In 1873 the Senate of Ohio, acting upon the theory that once proposed an amendment to the Constitution is always open to ratification, adopted a joint resolution ratifying the second of the 12 amendments submitted to the States by Congress in 1789, but then rejected, providing that "no law varying the compensation of Members of Congress shall take effect until an election for Representatives shall have intervened." This resolution, prepared by Madison, was an excellent one; but suppose it had been unjust, proposed, perhaps, in the interest of a section or of a party, and, failing at the time to receive the requisite majority, it had subsequently by a concerted rally of those interested in its adoption been carried without discussion or a clear expression of the existing public will; is that a true construction of the Constitution which may be followed by so dangerous consequences? And, supposing the right referred to exists, by what majority shall the resurrected amendments be adopted? If proposed in 1789, when the States numbered but 13 and when a majority of 10 States might have ratified the amendment, how many would have been requisite in 1873, when there were 38 States which would have been called upon to vote? If the answer should be that 29 States must have voted to ratify, since that number was three-fourths of all the States in 1873, however reasonable such an answer might seem, it would be founded upon no statute or custom of the country, and therefore different opinions as to its reasonableness might well be entertained. Hence the danger of confusion or conflict. We discuss this question here merely to emphasize the dangers involved in the Constitution as it stands and to show the necessity of legislation to make certain those points upon which doubts may arise in the employment of the constitutional process for amending the fundamental law of the Nation. A constitutional statute of limitation prescribing the time within which proposed amendments shall be adopted or be treated as waived ought by all means to be passed. (Jameson, John A. A treatise on constitutional conventions (4th ed., 1887), pp. 634-636).

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES PROPOSED BY CONGRESS BUT NOT RATIFIED BY THREE-FOURTHS OF THE STATES, COLLATED BY SENATOR ASHURST.

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES.

After the first enumeration required by the first article of the Constitution, there shall be one Representative for every 30,000 until the number shall amount to 100; after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall be not less than 100 Representatives nor less than 1 Representative for every 40,000 persons, until the number of Representatives shall amount to 200; after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall not be less than 200 Representatives nor more than 1 Representative for every 50,000 persons. (1 Stat., 97.) (Submitted at the same time as those which became part of the Constitution as amendments 1 to 10.)

Proposed by Congress September 15, 1789.

Ratified by the following States:

New Jersey, November 20, 1789. (Senate Journal, p. 199, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

Maryland, December 19, 1789. (Senate Journal, p. 106, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

North Carolina, December 22, 1789. (Senate Journal, p. 103, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

South Carolina, January 19, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 50, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

New Hampshire, January 25, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 105, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

New York, March 27, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 53, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

Rhode Island, June 15, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 110, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

Virginia, October 25, 1791. (Senate Journal, p. 30, 2d Cong., 1st sess.)

Pennsylvania, September 21, 1791. (Senate Journal, p. 11, 2d Cong., 1st sess.)

Vermont, November 3, 1791. (Senate Journal, p. 98, 2d Cong., 1st sess.)

Pennsylvania had first rejected the proposed amendment March 10, 1790.

Rejected by Delaware January 28, 1790.

The Journals give no record of the action of the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Georgia.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened. (1 Stat. 97.) (Submitted at the same time as those which became part of the Constitution as amendments 1 to 10.)

Proposed by Congress September 15, 1789.

Ratified by the following States:

Maryland, December 19, 1789. (Senate Journal, p. 106, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

North Carolina, December 22, 1789. (Senate Journal, p. 103, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

South Carolina, January 19, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 50, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

Delaware, January 28, 1790. (Senate Journal, p. 35, 1st Cong., 2d sess.)

Vermont, November 3, 1791. (Senate Journal, p. 98, 2d Cong., 1st sess.)

Virginia, December 15, 1791. (Senate Journal, p. 69, 2d Cong., 1st sess.)

Rejected by New Jersey, November 20, 1789 (Senate Journal, p. 199, 1st Cong., 2d sess.); New Hampshire, January 25, 1790 (Senate Journal, p. 105, 1st Cong., 2d sess.); Pennsylvania, March 10, 1790 (Senate Journal, p. 39, 1st Cong., 2d sess.); New York, March 27, 1790 (Senate Journal, p. 53, 1st Cong., 2d sess.); Rhode Island, June 15, 1790 (Senate Journal, p. 110, 1st Cong., 2d sess.).

The Journals give no record of the action of the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Georgia.

TITLES OF NOBILITY.

If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them or either of them. (2 Stat. 613.)

Proposed by Congress May 1, 1810.

Ratified by the following States:

Maryland, December 25, 1810.

Kentucky, January 31, 1811.

Ohio, January 31, 1811.

Delaware, February 2, 1811.

Pennsylvania, February 6, 1811.

New Jersey, February 13, 1811.

Vermont, October 24, 1811.

Tennessee, November 21, 1811.

Georgia, December 13, 1811.

North Carolina, December 23, 1811.

Massachusetts, February 27, 1812.

New Hampshire, December 10, 1812.

Rejected by New York (senate) March 12, 1811; Connecticut, May session, 1813; South Carolina, approved by senate November 28, 1811, reported unfavorably in house and not further considered December 7, 1813; Rhode Island, September 15, 1814.

AMENDMENT ABOLISHING OR INTERFERING WITH SLAVERY PROHIBITED (COWIN AMENDMENT).

No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State. (12 Stat. 251.)

Proposed by Congress March 2, 1861.

Ratified by the following States:

Ohio, March 13, 1861.

Maryland, January 10, 1862.

Illinois (convention), February 14, 1862.

ATTEMPTS TO REGULATE RATIFICATION.

On May 23, 1866, when the resolution proposing the fourteenth amendment was under consideration, Mr. Buckalew, of Pennsylvania, submitted an amendment to add to the resolution the following additional section:

"Sec. 6. This amendment shall be passed upon in each State by the legislature thereof which shall be chosen, or the members of the most popular branch of which shall be chosen, next after the submission of the amendment, and at its first session; and no acceptance or rejection shall be reconsidered or again brought in question at any subsequent session; nor shall any acceptance of the amendment be valid if made after three years from the passage of this resolution." (Cong. Globe, vol. 36, p. 2771.)

When the fifteenth amendment was before the Senate on February 3, 1869, Mr. Buckalew, of Pennsylvania, proposed to add to the resolution submitting it to the States the words:

"That the foregoing amendment shall be submitted to the legislatures of the several States, the most numerous branch of which shall be chosen next after the passage of this resolution." (Cong. Globe, vol. 40, p. 828.)

His speech in support of this proposal on February 5, 1869, is reported in the Congressional Globe, volume 40, pages 912 and 913. On February 9, 1869, this amendment was rejected—yeas 13, nays 43.

On February 17, 1869, an amendment practically identical with the above was offered by Mr. Hendricks, of Indiana, and the constitutionality of such a limitation was discussed by Senators Morton, Bayard, Buckalew, Dixon, and Yates. The question being taken, the amendment was rejected—yeas 12, nays 40. (Cong. Globe, vol. 40, pp. 1311-1314.)

On January 30, 1882, Mr. Berry, of California, introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116, 47th Cong., 1st sess.) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to regulate ratification, as follows:

"SECTION 1. The legislature of a State shall not vote upon a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States except at a regular session held following an election of the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, which election must take place subsequent to the time of submission by Congress or a convention of the proposed amendment."

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not take effect until the 5th of March, 1885."

On March 17, 1869, Mr. Morton, of Indiana, introduced in the Senate, and on March 29, 1869, Mr. Shanks, of Indiana, introduced in the House identical joint resolutions (S. J. Res. 32 and H. J. Res. 57, 41st Cong., 1st sess.), which read as follows:

"Be it resolved, etc., That on the sixth legislative day of a regular session, or of a legally called special session, of any State legislature, each house of said legislature, at the hour of 12 meridian, shall proceed

to the consideration of any amendment of the Constitution of the United States that may have been submitted by the Congress of the United States to the legislatures of the several States for ratification, according to the provisions of the fifth article of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That such amendment may not have been acted upon at any preceding session of said legislature. And if, upon the consideration of such amendment, it shall receive the votes of a majority of the members elected to each house of said legislature, it shall be held to be duly ratified by such legislature. And if final action is not taken upon the first day, then the house shall meet the next day at the same hour and so continue to meet from day to day (Sundays excepted) until final action is taken upon such amendment. Nor shall the action of either house of said legislature upon such amendment be hindered or prevented by the resignation or withdrawal, or the refusal to qualify, of a minority of either or of both houses of said legislature.

"Sec. 2. And be it further resolved, That if such amendment or amendments shall be ratified according to the provisions of the preceding section, the same shall be duly certified by the officers of each house and shall be transmitted by the governor of the State to the President of the United States."

(Cf. Ames, H. V. The proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States during the first century of its history. pp. 287-292.)

OPERATIONS OF THE BUDGET—ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT HARDING.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States, through the Vice President, Mr. Coolidge, delivered a very excellent address to the "members of the Government's business organization" at its fourth regular meeting having to do with operations of the Budget Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Record in regular Record type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record in 8-point type, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH COMMENDING BUDGET.

Following is the text of President Harding's address read by Vice President Coolidge yesterday on the operations of the Bureau of the Budget:

Members of the Government's business organization, this is the fourth regular meeting of the business organization of the Government. We have met to review the work of the first six months and to consider the task which confronts us for the remaining period of this fiscal year 1923 along the lines of co-ordination, economy, and efficiency—three inseparable factors to successful government. There can be no economy of operation without coordination, and efficiency without economy is impossible.

The first meeting of the business organization of the Government was held June 29, 1921, less than one month after the enactment of the budget and accounting act. We faced then the problem of inaugurating a budget system, and growing out of this the further problem of reforming the uncoordinated routine business of the Government. Probably there never was a time in our country's history when a revision of its financial procedures was so urgent and necessary. The habit of large expenditures, of almost unlimited obligation of the public credit, acquired during the World War, seemed difficult to restrain, while the continuing demand upon the National Treasury gave little indication of abatement.

POINTS WITH PRIDE TO RESULTS.

The budget and accounting act placed definitely upon the Chief Executive responsibility for checking the flood of expenditure. This task called for the help of the Government officers and employees, as the solution of the problem lay in coordination of the Government's business, requiring cooperation of its personnel and their commitment to a continuing constructive policy of economy. From this determination—that the solution of the financial problems of the Government could be achieved only by teamwork—came the call for that first meeting of those officials and employees in the Government service who have to do with its routine business. The campaign, then begun with such high hopes and courageous defiance of the obstacles to be overcome, is continuing to-day, and with no little pride and satisfaction we point to a continuing policy of economy with efficiency evidenced by the progressive and material reductions made in expenditures. This has been accomplished not only without impairment of the effective operation of the Government's departments and establishments but with an increase of efficiency resulting from a closer study of methods and cost of operation.

This achievement—your achievement—is a matter of great satisfaction to the Chief Executive, who takes this opportunity to express appreciation to all who have participated in the constructive and patriotic work, not only those charged with the administration of Government funds and who control large and important activities but, as well, those devoted Government people who have applied principles of economy to their daily work in various smaller ways through the conservation of Government supplies and time. When the spirit of real economy has permeated the entire rank and file of the public service, and the use of time and supplies is regarded as a public trust, many of our problems will be solved.

THREATENED DEFICIT RECALLED.

At our last meeting on July 11, 1922, we had just entered upon a new fiscal year. We were concerned over a threatened discrepancy of large proportions between estimated receipts and estimated expenditures. The executive departments estimated that they would call upon the Treasury during the 12 months of the year July 1, 1922, to June 30, 1923, for \$3,771,000,000, while the estimate of ordinary receipts for that period reached a total of only \$3,073,000,000. This situation indicated withdrawals from the Treasury of \$698,000,000 more than it was anticipated would be received from ordinary sources. At that time, however, I expressed confidence that with the Budget organization and your cooperation we need not be unduly concerned and urged additional concerted effort to curtail expenditures in the laudable endeavor to keep our expenditures within our income.

The statement of expected receipts and proposed and anticipated expenditures given in the Budget for 1924, transmitted to Congress December 5 last, showed a probable excess of expenditures over receipts for the fiscal year 1923 of \$273,000,000, a downward revision of \$425,000,000 in the estimate made in July, and a real downward revision of \$550,000,000 as the Budget statement included as an ordinary expenditure an item of \$125,000,000 for discount accruals on war savings securities due January 1, 1923, which was not embraced in the estimate made in July. I am now advised that a revised estimate, just completed, shows a further reduction in the anticipated deficit for 1923 of \$181,000,000, which indicates, as the situation exists to-day, an apparent deficit of \$92,000,000 for the current fiscal year. This gratifying result is due not only to reductions in the program of expenditure but also to an increase in the anticipated total of revenue and other receipts for the year. The adherence to the policy of economy and the effective coordination of routine business were important factors in reducing this estimated deficit.

What now confronts us is the overcoming of this estimated deficit of \$92,000,000, and, if possible, the closing of this fiscal year with a balance on the right side of the ledger. I must look to you, therefore, for continuing efforts to control your expenditures during the remainder of this fiscal year, for in this way you can aid materially. I know that I can rely upon you.

At my last meeting with you I emphasized the necessity of keeping the estimates for the next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1924, within the receipts for that year which, at that time, were estimated at \$3,198,000,000. I also stated that the probable receipts for the next fiscal year would not permit as liberal appropriations as were provided for the current year. It is a pleasure to state that the estimates of appropriations submitted to Congress for the fiscal year 1924 are \$120,000,000 less than the estimated receipts for that year, and \$196,000,000 less than the appropriations for the current year. Whatever pressure may have been brought to bear on the executive departments of the Government with reference to their estimates, there must have been in the departments concerned a spirit of sacrifice and cooperation to make this real achievement possible. Treasury conditions, however, demanded such cooperation and sacrifice. The Chief Executive expected it, but nevertheless wishes to express his full appreciation of it.

RESPONSIBLE FOR BUDGET.

In view of the importance of the subject and to guard against misapprehension as to the nature of the Budget, I take occasion to refer to the fundamental principles which control its preparation. Under the terms of the law the President is required to transmit the Budget. It is his Budget; he recommends it to Congress upon his own responsibility as the head of the executive branch of the Government. The estimates of appropriations contained therein are his estimates, except those for the legislative branch and the Supreme Court. The Budget law, recognizing the fact that the President could not personally attend to all of the details involved in the preparation of the Budget, gave to him an agency and designated it the Bureau of the Budget. It did not confer upon this bureau any function which it could exercise independently of rules and regulations of the President. There can not, therefore, be any conflict of procedure or policy between the President or the members of his Cabinet and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget as transmitted to Congress embodies the administrative policies which the President has decided to recommend.

Very significant and encouraging is the cooperation and collaboration between Congress and the Executive in connection with estimates for appropriations. It is the endeavor of the President to present to Congress calls for funds that are sufficient, and no more than sufficient, to carry out approved

policies. The budget and accounting act place no limitation upon the power and right of Congress to increase or decrease estimates submitted. This is in accord with the spirit of our institutions, and is as it should be. It is my hope and expectation that, as the Budget procedures develop, the estimates transmitted to Congress will be so carefully prepared, and will present so accurate a picture of the real operating needs of the Government as materially to lighten the burden of the appropriating committees. But it is not expected or desired that Congress should relinquish any of its prerogatives regarding public funds—prerogatives so wisely given to the people's representatives by the founders of the Government.

COORDINATION BRINGS RESULTS.

I am kept advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the constructive work being done by the various coordinating agencies and area coordinators under the immediate leadership of the chief coordinator, and of the value of the work being done by the several coordinating boards composed of the representatives of the departments and establishments. These coordinating agencies are accomplishing the purpose for which they were created—to provide the machinery through which to coordinate the activities of the departments and establishments, so as to guarantee the most provident and efficient expenditures of public funds, and to furnish the Executive an agency for imposing a unified, concerted plan of governmental routine business. The results attained show how admirable these important agencies are functioning. They are performing a most important part in the task of developing teamwork, instituting economies, and applying business principles to Government routine operation. These efforts have the interest and cordial indorsement of the Chief Executive.

I am also much interested in the organization of the Federal associations in various parts of the country carrying out from the seat of government into the field the gospel of teamwork, economy, and efficiency.

A subject always in mind when I meet with you is that of deficiency and supplemental estimates, and I am glad to note a marked improvement in the number, character, and amount of such estimates this fiscal year. The fact that Congress has made a new record in the passing of appropriation bills at an early date makes it certain that the heads of departments and establishments will have sufficient time before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924 to plan their expenditure program and apportion the funds appropriated to fit the program so planned. This makes it possible to avoid to a greater extent than in other years the necessity for supplemental and deficiency appropriations.

KEEPING OF RESERVES URGED.

I am not unmindful of the fact that many appropriations are made for disbursement by the departments, although the total of the obligations to be discharged is not within administrative control, payments being required to be made pursuant to the terms of specific statutes. Supplemental estimates in such cases can not be avoided, no matter how carefully estimates have been considered, both in the preparation and in the action by Congress thereon, unless the original estimate be made largely in excess of what past experience has indicated will be required. However, where appropriations are within the control of administrative officers a serious emergency only should justify departure from a well-considered plan of expenditure made in advance and contemplating a total within the amount fixed in the appropriating act. I shall expect, therefore, that in making expenditure plans for 1924 you will give this subject most careful consideration and in making apportionment of appropriations under your control you will not fail to make provision, usually by setting up a reasonable reserve, for the ordinary variation in the needs of the several periods of the year and what may be called ordinary emergencies.

General Lord, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, will take up with you in detail the work of the past six months, with particular reference to the preparation of the Budget and the work of the various coordinating agencies, and I give way to him, expressing in closing, however, my satisfaction and appreciation of the good work you have done, the good work you are doing, and the good work I know you will continue to do.

WORK FOR WHOLE NATION.

If you have made sacrifices of certain cherished plans in connection with your work in order that expenditures might be reduced, if you have become discouraged and wearied at this continuing insistence upon economy, if you have labored, as possibly some of you have labored, without apparent recognition of your services, we should remember that what we are

doing is not for ourselves, not for our immediate chief, not for the President of the United States, but for the people, the stockholders of this great business, who are dependent upon us for the welfare and the proper conduct of this great business. Honest work well and faithfully done brings its own recompense in the consciousness of duty performed. To you, representatives of the business organization of the Government, and to all my faithful collaborators in the Government service, wherever stationed, I tender my thanks and appreciation for services rendered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TO-MORROW.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RURAL-CREDIT FACILITIES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4287) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act; and for other purposes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senate has now been in session 4 hours and 20 minutes to-day, and, while it is constantly asserted by certain Senators across the aisle that they are vitally interested in the welfare of the farmer and are anxious to see rural credits legislation passed at this session, we have not even touched the consideration of the pending bill to-day.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] occupied something like three hours of the time of the Senate this afternoon in what I think was clear to everyone was an undisguised filibuster. That would not have been so serious if it were not for the fact that the Senators who are discussing extraneous subjects and occupying the time of the Senate, when they ought to be considering the question before the Senate, are preventing thousands of farmers in this country from obtaining the credit facilities for the planting of their crops this spring which they might obtain if Senators would address themselves to the pending legislation. At best this bill can not become a law and be put into operation by whatever agency shall be created within 30 or 60 days. Do not those Senators see that if the discussion drifts on as it has been drifting, every day that is wasted in the Senate instead of being devoted to the consideration of the pending legislation may mean the loss of the proposed credit facilities to the farmers of the United States for the planting of their crops this year?

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Mississippi would be delighted if I should fall into his trap, as some other Senators sometimes do, and aid him in his efforts to delay matters by replying to him, but I am not going to do that. The Senator from Mississippi, however, like other Senators, when he engages in making a speech solely for the purpose of delay necessarily can not be very accurate in his statements. That was true in the case of the Senator from Mississippi to-day. He occupied half an hour of the time of the Senate in an effort to argue that President Harding took no interest in the needs of agriculture or in a financial credit system for the farmer until after the election last November.

Mr. President, in order that whoever may hereafter read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may ascertain for himself how utterly reckless the Senator from Mississippi has been in his statements to-day I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the speech of President Harding at the agricultural conference called by him more than a year ago, at which time he discussed this whole question fully, utterly refuting the statement of the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address of the President is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Secretary Wallace and members of the conference, it is an occasion of the greatest satisfaction to me that Secretary Wallace's invitation has been so widely and cordially accepted. I confess the firm belief that in the public life of a people so intelligent as the American Nation most problems may be regarded as well on the way to solution when they are once reduced to their simplest terms and generally understood. This conference was called with the aim to bring about such a general understanding of the critical situation now confronting American agriculture.

We all understand that this conference is not a legislative body. Its recommendations will require to be written into the statute books by other authorities, or applied in administration, after sanction by those who must assume responsibility. But we do confidently anticipate that the considerations here had will be helpful and illuminating to those immediately responsible for the formulation of public policy in dealing with these problems. Therefore it has seemed to me I can make no more appropriate observation than that your work here will

be of value precisely as you address yourselves to the realities, the matters of fact, the understanding of conditions as they are, and the proposal of feasible and practicable methods for dealing with those conditions.

Concerning the grim reality of the present crisis in agriculture, there can be no differences of opinion among informed people. The depressions and discouragements are not peculiar to agriculture, and I think it fair to say there could have been no avoidance of a great slump from war-time excesses to the hardships of readjustment. We can have no helpful understanding by assuming that agriculture suffers alone, but we may fairly recognize the fundamental difficulties which accentuate the agricultural discouragements and menace the healthful life of this basic and absolutely necessary industry.

I do not need to tell you or the country of the supreme service that the farmer rendered our Nation and the world during the war. Peculiar circumstances placed our allies in Europe, as well as our own country, in a position of peculiar and unprecedented dependence on the American farmer. With his labor supply limited and in conditions which made producing costs high beyond all precedent, the farmer rose to the emergency. He did everything that was asked of him, and more than most people believed it was possible for him to do. Now, in his hour of disaster, consequent on the reaction from the feverish conditions of war, he comes to us asking that he be given support and assistance which shall testify our appreciation of his service. To this he is entitled, not only for the service he has done but because if we fail him we will precipitate a disaster that will affect every industrial and commercial activity of the Nation.

The administration has been keenly alive to the situation, and has given encouragement and support to every measure which it believed calculated to ameliorate the condition of agriculture. In the effort to finance crop movements, to expand foreign markets, to expand credits at home and abroad, much has been accomplished. These have been, it is true, largely in the nature of emergency measures. So long as the emergency continues, it must be dealt with as such; but at the same time there is every reason for us to consider those permanent modifications of policy which may make relief permanent, may secure agriculture so far as possible against the danger that such conditions will arise again, and place it as an industry in the firmest and most assured position for the future.

You men are thoroughly familiar with the distressing details of present conditions in the agricultural community. The whole country has an acute concern with the conditions and the problems which you are met to consider. It is a truly national interest, and not entitled to be regarded as primarily the concern of either a class or a section.

Agriculture is the oldest and most elemental of industries. Every other activity is intimately related to and largely dependent upon it. It is the first industry to which society makes appeal in every period of distress and difficulty. When war is precipitated, the first demand is made on the farmer, that he will produce the wherewithal for both combatants and the civil population to be fed, and in large part also to be clothed and equipped. It is a curious fact that agriculture has always been the first line of support of communities in war and too commonly the victim of those distresses which emanate from great conflicts. Perhaps I may be pardoned a word by way of developing this idea. Until comparatively very recent times the land was the first prize of victory in war. The conqueror distributed the subjugated soil among his favorites and gave them his prisoners as slaves to work it. Thus the ownership of the land became the symbol of favor and aristocracy, while the working of it was regarded as the task of menials, dedicated to ill-paid toil in order that the owners of the land and the rulers of the state might be able to maintain themselves in luxury and to enforce their political authority.

Coming down through the ages, we see the advance of civilization gradually emancipating the soil from this low estate. We see the institutions of serfdom and villenage, under the feudal order, succeeding those of slavery. Later we see the creation of a rural peasantry, comprising broadly those who till the soil but in most cases do not own it, and whose political rights are very restricted. It is, indeed, not until we come to very recent times and to our own country's development that we see the soil lifted above the taint of this unjust hereditarily and restored to the full dignity and independence to which it is entitled.

Even in our own times and under the most modern and enlightened establishments the soil has continued to enjoy less liberal institutions for its encouragement and promotion than many other forms of industry. Commerce and manufacturing have been afforded ample financial facilities for their encouragement and expansion, while agriculture on the whole has lagged behind. The merchant, the manufacturer, the great instruments of public transportation, have been provided methods by which they enlist necessary capital more readily than does the farmer. A great manufacturing industry can consolidate under the ownership of a single corporation with a multitude of stockholders, a great number of originally separate establishments, and thus effect economies and concentrations, and acquire for itself a power in the markets where it must buy and in the markets where it must sell, such as have not been made available to agriculture. The farmer is the most individualistic and independent citizen among us. He comes nearest to being self-sufficient; but precisely because of this he has not claimed for himself the right to employ those means of cooperation, coordination, and consolidation which serve so usefully in other industries. A score or more of manufacturers consolidate their interests under a corporate organization and attain a great increase of their power in the markets, whether they are buying or selling. The farmer, from the very mode of his life, has been estopped from these effective combinations; therefore, because he buys and sells as an individual, it is his fate to buy in the dearest and sell in the cheapest market.

The great industrial corporation sells its bonds in order to get what we may call its fixed or plant capital, just as the farmer sells a mortgage on his land in order to get at least a large part of his fixed or plant capital. I am not commending the bonding or mortgage system of capitalization, rather only recognizing a fact. But there in large part the analogy ends. Both the manufacturer and the farmer still require provision of working capital. The manufacturer, whose turnover is rapid, finds that in the seasons when he needs unusual amounts of working capital he can go to the bank and borrow on short-time notes. His turnover is rapid, and the money will come back in time to meet his short-term obligation. The merchant finances his operations in the same way. But the farmer is in a different case. His turnover period is a long one; his annual production is small compared to the amount of investment. For almost any crop the turnover period is at least a year; for live stock it may require two or three years for a single turnover. Yet the farmer is compelled, if he borrows his working capital, to borrow for short periods, to renew his paper several times before his turnover is possible, and to take the chance that if he

is called upon untimely to pay off his notes he may be compelled to sacrifice growing crops or unfinished live stock. Obviously the farmer needs to have provisions adapted to his requirements for extension of credit to produce his working capital.

Under the necessities of war time consolidation and centralization of credit resources and financial capabilities went far to sustain the struggle. Essential industries were extended the help and support of society because society recognized its dependence on them. Much that was economically unsound and unfair was perpetrated under cover of this effort to uphold necessary industrial factors. But the lesson was useful and justifies inquiry as to whether, properly adapted to peace conditions, the methods of larger integration and wider cooperation might not well be projected into times of peace.

The need of better financial facilities for the farmer must be apparent on the most casual consideration of the profound divergence between methods of financing agriculture and other industries. The farmer who owns his farm is capitalist, executive, and laborer all in one. As capitalist he earns the smaller return on his investment. As executive he is little paid, and as laborer he is greatly underpaid in comparison to labor in other occupations.

There is much misconception regarding the financial status of agriculture. If the mortgage indebtedness of farms shows over a given period a marked tendency to increase, the fact becomes occasion for concern. If during the same period the railroads or the great industries controlled by corporations find themselves able to increase their mortgage indebtedness by dint of bond issues, the fact is heralded as evidence of better business conditions and of capital's increased willingness to engage in these industries and thus insure larger production and better employment of labor. Both the mechanism of finance and the preconceptions of the community are united in creating the impression that easy access to ample capital is a disadvantage to the farmer, and an evidence of his decay in prosperity, while precisely the same circumstances are construed in other industries as evidence of prosperity and of desirable business expansion.

In the matter of what may be called fixed investment capital, the disadvantage of the farmer so strongly impressed public opinion that a few years ago the Federal Farm Loan Board was established to afford better supplies of capital for plant investment and to insure moderate interest rates. But while unquestionably farm finance has benefited, the board has thus far not extended its operations to the provision of working capital for the farmer as distinguished from permanent investment in the plant. There should be developed a thorough code of law and business procedure, with the proper machinery of finance, through some agency, to insure that turnover capital shall be as generously supplied to the farmer and on as reasonable terms as to other industries. An industry more vital than any other, in which nearly half the Nation's wealth is invested can be relied upon for good security and certain returns.

In the aggregate, the capital indebtedness of the country's agricultural plant is small, not large. Compared with other industries, the wonder is that agriculture, thus deprived of easy access to both investment and accommodation capital, has prospered even so well.

The lines on which financial support of agriculture may be organized are suggested in the plan of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and in those rural finance societies which have been so effective in some European countries. The cooperative loaning associations of Europe have been effective incentives to united action by farmers, and have led them directly into cooperation in both production and marketing which have contributed greatly to the stabilization and prosperity of agriculture. Whether we examine the cooperative societies of Russia, now recognized as the most potent support in that disturbed country for orderly society, or whether we turn to the great and illuminated cooperative associations which have strengthened the California agricultural industries; whether we examine the cooperative societies of Ireland and Denmark or the like organizations which handle the potatoes of Maine, or the cantaloupes of Colorado; whether we consider these organizations as means to buying the farmer's requirements in a cheaper market or to selling his products in a more remunerative one, the conclusion is in all cases the same. It is, that the farmer is as good a business man as any other when he has the chance; that he is capable of organization, cooperation, and coordination; that he will apply sound methods to his business whenever he has the chance; that his credit can be better established, his particular needs of capital on terms suited to his requirements can be met; that, these things accomplished, he ceases to be an underpaid laborer, an unpaid executive, and a capitalist with an unremunerative investment.

It can not be too strongly urged that the farmer must be ready to help himself. This conference would do most lasting good if it would find ways to impress the great mass of farmers to avail themselves of the best methods. By this I mean that, in the last analysis, legislation can do little more than give the farmer the chance to organize and help himself.

Take cooperative marketing. American farmers are asking for, and it should be possible to afford them, ample provision of law under which they may carry on in cooperative fashion those business operations which lend themselves to that method, and which, thus handled, would bring advantage to both the farmer and his consuming public. In countries where these facilities and opportunities have been afforded such cooperative organizations have been carried to the highest usefulness and are recognized as aiding both farmer and consumer. They make the farmer's selling price higher and the consumer's buying price lower.

But when we shall have done this, the farmers must become responsible for doing the rest. They must learn organization and the practical procedures of cooperation. These things we can not do for them, but we can and should give them the chance to do them for themselves. It will be for them to demonstrate their readiness and willingness and ability to utilize such instrumentalities. There is need for wide dissemination of information and understanding of methods, and for development of what I may call the spirit and purpose of cooperation. The various excellent societies of farmers which are represented here have a large responsibility in this regard. They have already done much, but they have much more to do if the American farmer shall be brought most effectively to help himself through organization and cooperation.

One of the most serious obstacles to a proper balancing of agricultural production lies in the lack of essential information. All too frequently such information is gathered by private interests whose concern is private profit rather than the general good. Agriculture can not thrive under conditions which permit the speculator, the broker, the forecaster, because of superior information, to become chief beneficiaries. The element of speculation in crop production is at best so great as to dictate that other speculative elements, always liable to

be manipulated to the disadvantage of the producer, shall be reduced to the minimum.

With proper financial support for agriculture, and with instrumentalities for the collection and dissemination of useful information, a group of cooperative-marketing organizations would be able to advise their members as to the probable demand for staples, and to propose measures for proper limitation of acreages in particular crops. The certainty that such scientific distribution of production was to be observed would strengthen the credit of agriculture and increase the security on which financial advances could be made to it.

The disastrous effects which arise from overproduction are notorious. The congressional joint committee on agricultural conditions in the valuable report which it has recently issued declares that a deficiency of one-tenth in the production of a particular staple means an increase of three-tenths in the price, while a deficit of two-tenths in production will mean an increase of eight-tenths in the price.

The converse of this is just as emphatically true. In a recent address to the Congress I stated this situation thus:

"It is rather shocking to be told, and to have the statement strongly supported, that 9,000,000 bales of cotton raised on American plantations in a given year will actually be worth more to the producers than 13,000,000 would have been. Equally shocking is the statement that 700,000,000 bushels of wheat raised by American farmers would bring them more money than a billion bushels. Yet these are not exaggerated statements. In a world where there are tens of millions who need food and clothing which they can not get such a condition is sure to indict the social system which makes it possible."

It is apparent that the interest of the consumer, quite equally with that of the producer, demands measures to prevent these violent fluctuations which result from unorganized and haphazard production. Indeed, the statistics of this entire subject clearly demonstrate that the consumer's concern for better stabilized conditions is quite equal to that of the producer. The farmer does not demand special consideration to the disadvantage of any other class; he asks only for that consideration which shall place his vital industry on a parity of opportunity with others and enable it to serve the broadest interest.

No country is so dependent upon railroad transportation as is the United States. The irregular coast lines of Europe, its numerous indenting arms of the sea, as well as its great river system, afford that continent exceptional water transportation. The vast continental area of the United States is quite differently situated, its greater dependence upon railroad transportation being attested by its possession of nearly one-half the railroad mileage of the world; and even this is not adequate. The inevitable expansion of population will enormously increase the burden upon our transportation facilities, and proper forethought must dictate the present adoption of wise and far-seeing policies in dealing with transportation.

If broad-visioned statesmanship shall establish fundamentally sound policies toward transportation, the present crisis will one day be regarded as a piece of good fortune to the Nation. To this time railroad construction, financing, and operation have been unscientific and devoid of proper consideration for the wider concerns of the community. To say this is simply to admit a fact which applies to practically every railroad system in the world. It is as true regarding the railroads of Canada and Great Britain as it is in reference to those of the United States. It is equally applicable to the railways of continental Europe, in whose development considerations of political and military availability have too far overweighed economic usefulness. In America we have too long neglected our waterways. We need a practical development of water resources for both transportation and power. A large share of railway tonnage is coal for railroad fuel. The experience of railway electrification demonstrates the possibility of reducing this waste and increasing efficiency. We may well begin very soon to consider plans to electrify our railroads. If such a suggestion seems to involve inordinate demands upon our financial and industrial power, it may be replied that three generations ago the suggestion of building 260,000 miles of railways in this country would have been scouted as a financial and industrial impossibility. Waterway improvement represents not only the possibility of expanding our transportation system, but also of producing hydroelectric power for its operation and for the activities of widely diffused industry.

I have spoken of the advantage which Europe enjoys because of its easy access to the sea, the cheapest and surest transportation facility. In our own country is presented one of the world's most attractive opportunities for extension of the seaways many hundred miles inland. The heart of the continent, with its vast resources in both agriculture and industry, would be brought in communication with all the ocean routes by the execution of the St. Lawrence waterway project. To enable ocean-going vessels to have access to all the ports of the Great Lakes would have a most stimulating effect upon the industrial life of the continent's interior. The feasibility of the project is unquestioned, and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small. Disorganized and prostrate, the nations of central Europe are even now setting their hands to the development of a great continental waterway, which, connecting the Rhine and Danube, will bring water transportation from the Black to the North Sea, from Mediterranean to Baltic. If nationalist prejudices and economic difficulties can be overcome by Europe, they certainly should not be formidable obstacles to an achievement less expensive and giving promise of yet greater advantages to the peoples of North America. Not only would the cost of transportation be greatly reduced but a vast population would be brought overnight in immediate touch with the markets of the entire world.

This conference needs have no fear of unfortunate effects from the fullest development of national resources. A narrow view might dictate, in the present agricultural stress, antagonism to projects of reclamation, rehabilitation, and extension of the agricultural area. To the contrary, if agriculture is to hold its high place, there must be the most liberal policy in extending its opportunity. The war, as was recently well said by the Secretary of Agriculture, has brought our country more quickly, but not more inevitably, to the necessity of deciding whether this shall be predominantly an industrial country or one in which industry and agriculture shall be encouraged to prosper side by side, and to complement each other in building here a community of diverse interests. If our policy shall be, as it ought, to encourage the dual development, then we have need to consider the early and continuing reclamation of those great areas which with proper treatment would become valuable additions to our agricultural capacity. To this end every practical proposal for watering our arid and semiarid land, for reclaiming cut-over forest areas, for protecting fertile valleys from inundations, and for draining the potentially rich and widely extended swamp areas, should be given the full encourage-

ment of the Government. All this should be a part of recognized permanent policy. Not otherwise will it be possible to keep the Nation self-supporting and as nearly self-contained as it has been in the past.

There must be a new conception of the farmer's place in our social and economic scheme. The time is long past when we may think of farming as an occupation fitting for the man who is not equipped for or has somehow failed at some other line of endeavor. The successful farmer of to-day, far from being an untrained laborer working every day and every hour that sun and weather permit, is required to be the most expert and particularly the most versatile of artisans, executives, and business men. He must be a good deal of an engineer, to deal with problems of drainage, road building, and the like. He requires the practical knowledge of an all-round mechanic to handle his machinery and get best results from it. The problems of stock raising and breeding demand understanding of biology, while those of plant raising and breeding call for a wide practical knowledge of botany and plant pathology.

In handling his soils for best results, in using fertilizers, determining rotations, and in selecting and using feeds for stock he has need for a working knowledge of chemistry. As our timber supply is reduced, his service in conserving and expanding the timber resources of the farm will be increasingly important, necessitating an intimacy with forestry and forestation. There is no business in which the executive talents of the skilled organizer and manager are more absolutely necessary than in successful farming, and this applies alike to the producing, the buying, and the selling phases of farming. Along with all this the farmer must have untiring energy and a real love and enthusiasm for his splendid profession. For such I choose to call the vocation of the farmer—the most useful, and, it ought to be made, one of the most attractive among all lines of human effort.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest, in connection with what the Senator from Wisconsin stated, that a month or so ago many Senators on this floor were urging the importance of legislation for the farmer; they were urging the necessity of the Senate proceeding at once to the consideration of rural credit measures, and yet now, when rural credit legislation is before the Senate, apparently they have lost their zeal for the farmer and have taken the time of the Senate upon entirely extraneous matters, thereby preventing the passage of legislation that would be of benefit to the farmer.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to say there is not any question but that the rural credits bill will pass the Senate; there is no effort being made to prevent its passage. It is pretty well understood there will be no difficulty about the enactment of the legislation by this Congress so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for a vote on my amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wish to say merely a word with reference to the amendment. I doubt very much whether the provision of the Federal reserve act which the Senator from Alabama seeks to repeal by the amendment ever did any good, and I am perfectly sure there is no occasion for retaining it in the law now. My own view is that any bank that would be willing to pay as high a rate of interest as the Senator from Alabama has so often narrated to the Senate ought not to be given credit at all, and it would not be if this provision of the law were repealed. The provision is not any longer in force, so far as the Federal Reserve Board is concerned, and is not utilized, and I think that it ought to be repealed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is true that the provision is not now utilized and the rediscount rate has been reduced, but the provision is still in the law and ought to be taken out, because if it remains in the law at some time in the future it may again be resorted to. I ask for a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. KING. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 13. That the act approved April 13, 1920, being Public, No. 170, Sixty-sixth Congress, entitled "An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to offer some perfecting amendments. On page 2, line 16, after the word "corporation," I move to strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator why that change should be made? The sentence seems to be grammatical with the present punctuation.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not want the words "organized under the laws of any State" to relate back to national banks; that

is all. National banks, of course, are not organized under the laws of any State.

Mr. FLETCHER. But the Senator proposes to include in the act incorporated live-stock loan or farm-credit companies?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes. I am going to offer another amendment to insert the words "or of the United States," so as to include the corporations provided for under the Capper bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to strike out the comma and insert a semicolon at the place indicated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 2, line 19, after the word "State," I move to insert the words "or of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 5, line 22, after the words "live stock," I move to insert the word "loan."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether the antecedent is clearly shown there; that is, whether the context would indicate that it was intended to include live-stock loan companies?

Mr. LENROOT. It will read "live-stock loan company."

Mr. KING. Is the Senator proposing to amend existing law?

Mr. LENROOT. No; this is new legislation.

Mr. KING. I apprehend that there is a distinction between a live-stock company and a live-stock loan company.

Mr. LENROOT. That is why I want to put in the word "loan." The word "loan" has been omitted merely through an error. The provision is only intended to refer to live-stock loan companies.

Mr. KING. That is what I was inquiring about, whether there was anything in this bill or in the bill of which this is amendatory to indicate that a live-stock loan company was in contemplation of the legislators rather than a live-stock company.

Mr. LENROOT. That was one of the primary purposes of the Capper bill.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in page 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 13, on lines 4, 5, and 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "and may be paid out of any surplus in excess of 100 per cent of subscribed capital."

Mr. KING. I ask that that amendment be again stated.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Wisconsin explain that amendment?

Mr. LENROOT. This amendment and the one following that will be offered to this section are to make it identical with the amendments that were adopted to the same provision in the Capper bill. Senators will remember that there was a good deal of discussion and controversy over that section of the bill, and the matter was settled by the Senate. This amendment is merely to carry out the will of the Senate, as expressed in the Capper bill, with respect to this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 13, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the words "and surplus," so that, if amended, it will read:

Out of any net earnings remaining after the aforesaid dividends claims have been fully met there shall be paid each year—

And so forth.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me inquire the significance of that and see that we fully apprehend it, because it seems to me that that is an amendment of some importance.

Mr. LENROOT. I will say that as this language was originally written—the Senator will remember that it was fully discussed in connection with the Capper bill—no dividend could be paid until a surplus of 100 per cent had been accumulated. That was changed so that the dividend may be paid out of pending earnings, but after the dividend is paid a surplus shall be accumulated until it shall amount to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital; and then, when 12 per cent is earned, an additional 3 per cent may be distributed, and of the remaining earnings 10 per cent may be paid to the surplus and 90 per cent as an additional franchise tax.

Mr. McLEAN. It conforms to the present law.

Mr. LENROOT. It conforms to the present law exactly.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether the amendment which he has just offered meets the concurrence of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. LENROOT. The chairman of the committee is here. He himself offered the same amendment to the Capper bill.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes. These amendments were offered and adopted to the Capper bill, because as the bill now reads no dividend could be paid until the Federal reserve bank had accumulated a surplus of 100 per cent, and that was not intended by the committee; it was not intended by the author of the bill; and we had to make this correction so that the Federal reserve banks could draw their dividends on their stocks as under the original act. There was no intention to interfere with that; but the Capper bill, as originally drawn, contained that error, and we want this provision to be identical with the provision in the Capper bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator to what extent he is seeking to modify the provisions of the original Federal reserve law, which is the existing law dealing with this particular question?

Mr. McLEAN. None whatever, except that when the banks earn more than 12 per cent, and have their 100 per cent put aside, then 3 per cent can be added to the dividends on the stock, as an invitation to the State banks to come into the system.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as I understand, this language with the words stricken out as proposed by the Senator is precisely the same as in the Federal reserve act.

Mr. McLEAN. Precisely.

Mr. FLETCHER. So there is no change in that provision.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand the Senator, it was not contemplated by the committee or by the proponent of this bill that the words "and surplus" should be there?

Mr. McLEAN. No. If the Senator will read the provision as printed in the bill, he will see that no dividend can be paid until the bank has accumulated 100 per cent surplus.

Mr. KING. Yes; I understand.

Mr. McLEAN. It was an error in drafting the bill, and it was noticed, and I had it corrected in the Capper bill, and it should be corrected in this bill.

Mr. KING. But it passed unnoticed in the committee, and the committee in reporting the bill did not ask for emendation as suggested now by the Senator?

Mr. McLEAN. It was amended in the Senate when the Capper bill came into the Senate.

Mr. KING. I am speaking of the present bill—the Lenroot bill—now under discussion.

Mr. McLEAN. This bill was reported before the Capper bill was passed, I think.

Mr. LENROOT. It was agreed in the committee that the same changes should be made in both bills.

Mr. KING. Then it was just an error in reporting the bill without noticing this proposed amendment?

Mr. LENROOT. It was; and I think it arose from the fact that the original draftsman of that section assumed that 100 per cent surplus had been accumulated in all of the banks, and that has proved not to be so.

Mr. McLEAN. That was the assumption; but it was ascertained that the Dallas bank had not accumulated the surplus.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, on line 17, does not the Senator think the language would be a little clearer if we added, after the word "earnings," the words "of any year," so that it would read:

And thereafter when net earnings of any year exceed 12 per cent.

Mr. LENROOT. That is all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 13, line 17, after the word "earnings," it is proposed to insert "of any year," so that it will read:

And thereafter when net earnings of any year exceed 12 per cent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. Also, on the same page, it is proposed to strike out lines 19 and 20 and to insert in lieu thereof the following words:

And 10 per cent of the remaining net earnings shall be paid into the surplus and 90 per cent shall be paid to the United States as an additional franchise tax.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the purpose of the amendment he is tendering now?

Mr. LENROOT. Under this provision they are entitled to a normal dividend of 6 per cent. Out of the additional earnings

they are required to build up a surplus. When the surplus amounts to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital, and when the earnings in any year exceed 12 per cent, they may declare an additional dividend of 3 per cent to the stockholders. Of anything then remaining, 10 per cent must go to additional surplus to build up the surplus further, and 90 per cent must go to the Treasury as a franchise tax.

Mr. KING. What is paid now as a franchise tax?

Mr. LENROOT. Part of it goes to surplus. The act has been amended, and I do not remember just what the present provision is.

Mr. McLEAN. The franchise tax is the surplus paid into the Treasury.

Mr. KING. May I address an inquiry to the Senator from Wisconsin, as well as the able chairman of the committee, about the criticisms which we have heard from time to time about the enormous earnings of the Federal reserve member banks?

The Senators know that criticisms have been made upon the floor of the Senate, and criticisms have frequently appeared in the press to the effect that during the past year or two the earnings of the members of the Federal reserve system—at least, some of them—have been extremely great; indeed, so great as to have led to the criticism that these banks were profiteering.

I express no opinion relative to those criticisms. I simply ask the chairman of the committee whether, in dealing with this question—the earnings of the Federal reserve banks, the disposition to be made of them, the amount to be paid in dividends, and the amount to be paid as a franchise tax—any investigation was made of these criticisms, and if the committee felt that there was any necessity of amending existing law other than in the particulars submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McLEAN. That criticism has been directed to the bill many times—the feeling that they were making too much money. The Senator knows that these profits do not affect the discount rate.

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. McLEAN. That is an entirely different matter, and must be fixed by some one, and must be paid in order to control the system, and the Senator will find that at the present time the profits are not large. They were necessarily large during the years of expansion, and the feeling of the committee was that it was pretty difficult to anticipate with regard to these profits. A good many of the banks, I think, are not making much of anything now, and inasmuch as this surplus goes into the Treasury of the United States, and does not affect the discount rate, the committee saw no reason for changing the law. It would not benefit the borrower in any way.

Mr. KING. The Senator recalls that the criticism went a little further, perhaps, than I indicate, namely, that in order rather to conceal their enormous profits they had been paying extravagant salaries to the employees of the banks, and, indeed, had been employing too many persons. I do not know that a consideration of that question would be pertinent or really germane to this bill; and yet I observe that attempts are made in this bill to amend the existing Federal reserve act in respect to a great many matters, and it occurred to me that if those criticisms had any justification it might be well to curb any evils that the committee may have found to exist in the administration of the law.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator knows that the commission of inquiry that was appointed more than a year ago went into that subject very carefully, and it was assumed that if any additional legislation was warranted it would have been suggested by that commission. No such recommendation was made, however, and if the Senator will read the testimony which was presented to that commission I think he will be satisfied that many of these insinuations and attacks upon the system, based upon the assumption that exorbitant salaries had been paid, were largely without foundation.

Mr. KING. It did seem to me that the criticism in regard to the actions of the board controlling the bank in New York had some foundation. It did seem to me that the amount proposed to be expended for the erection of a building was rather excessive, and that there seemed to be rather a disposition upon the part of the board of the bank in New York to treat their enterprise as one so absolutely divorced from the Federal Government or from Federal control as that the directors could do as they pleased with the proceeds, pay the dividends they pleased, pay the salaries they pleased, and expend an extravagant amount in the erection of buildings.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator allow me to make an observation there?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly,

Mr. KING. That was the impression made upon me by revelations here in the Senate, and by the debate.

Mr. McLEAN. That has been explained many times. It was explained a few days ago by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], and I do not think there is very much foundation for the criticism.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There has been, as stated, a ruthless attack against the reserve bank in New York for putting up its building, and on account of the salaries it pays. As a matter of fact, the size of its business rivals that of the greatest banks in the city. Its salaries are less than the average paid by banks doing the same amount of business. The building it is putting up, on the basis of cost per cubic foot, is cheaper than the average bank building put up by a bank doing an equal amount of business. The attacks on it have been utterly unjustified.

Mr. KING. I have heard those attacks made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. So have I.

Mr. KING. And I have seen no refutation or any reply to the attacks. I may ask the Senator from Connecticut, in conclusion, as to this item, if as chairman of the committee he is satisfied with the amendment which has been offered, and if he feels that that deals with the subject now as comprehensively as the subject should be dealt with?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly. These amendments were offered at my suggestion, and all of them were adopted as amendments to the Capper bill. They are necessary, unless the desire is to prevent the member banks from drawing any dividends on their subscriptions until the regional banks get 100 per cent surplus.

Mr. KING. I am not sufficiently advised to make such a recommendation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wisconsin desires to reach a conclusion on the pending bill, I will submit a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the request.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending bill shall close at 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, February 5, 1923, and that in the meantime no other legislation shall be considered unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Glass | McCumber | Smith |
| Ball | Gooding | McKellar | Spencer |
| Brookhart | Hale | McLean | Stanfield |
| Bursum | Harris | McNary | Sterling |
| Calder | Harrison | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Cameron | Johnson | New | Swanson |
| Capper | Jones, Wash. | Norbeck | Trammell |
| Colt | Kellogg | Norris | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | Kendrick | Oddie | Walsh, Mass. |
| Ernst | King | Phipps | Walsh, Mont. |
| Fernald | Ladd | Poin Dexter | Warren |
| Fletcher | Lenroot | Reed, Pa. | Watson |
| George | Lodge | Shields | |
| Gerry | McCormick | Shortridge | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will report the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending bill shall close at 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, February 5, 1923, and that in the meantime no other legislation shall be considered unless by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to entering into the proposed agreement?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I can not consent to fixing Monday. I may say to the Senator from Florida that I would be willing to enter into an agreement to close debate on Friday, but I can not consent to any later date than that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that perhaps we may get together and agree on a time. We do not want to have any more delay in this matter than we can avoid, and I suggest Saturday at 3 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No. I am very anxious to get this farm legislation through; I think it ought to be passed at an early date. We can not get it through too early to meet the situation that will develop in the spring, and I am willing to fix a time on Friday.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact, known to all Senators here, that on a Saturday very little work is done. It is very hard to keep a quorum of the Senate on Saturday, and I think

if he will make it Saturday, we will get together. We would not save any time by fixing Friday. If the Senator would make it Saturday at 3 o'clock, I do not think there would be any objection, and we would get this bill out of the way and go on then to the consideration of other work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, we ought to be here on Saturday doing the work of the session. I am willing to make it 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock on Friday, but I am not willing to go beyond Friday. I think that is very reasonable.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, that is merely an arbitrary distinction, if we are really and truly in earnest about saving time. I have served with the Senator a good long time, and I do not think either one of us has ever been guilty of trespassing upon the time of the Senate. I make a plea to him that in the interest of saving time we make it Saturday.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I plead with the Senator, in the interest of saving time and in the interest of saving night sessions, that we close it up on Friday.

Mr. SMITH. The proposition was to fix Monday as the date for a vote, and making it Saturday just splits the difference between Friday and Monday. Everything is arrived at by compromise. The Senator fixes Friday on the one side, and it was proposed on the other side to fix Monday, and I come in and split the difference.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The proposition was really to have night sessions beginning to-morrow night, and to try to limit debate to-morrow. That is what we are trying to do. I do not desire to be arbitrary, and I do not think I have been so; but I think it is best, if our minds are set on a matter, to frankly state it. I can not agree to fixing a later day than Friday.

Mr. HARRISON. Will not the Senator allow this question to be submitted to the Senate? There is a difference of opinion about it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. HARRISON. There are Senators on this side who do not want to agree to vote even on Monday, but we have tried to get together on Monday as the day when we shall vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are Senators on this side who do not desire to agree to vote on Friday.

Mr. HARRISON. I was in hopes we could agree on this proposition, because it disarranges everything to have to meet here at night.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, it does not inconvenience some of us.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am willing to try to avoid it. Mr. HARRISON. We would save a good deal of time by agreeing to vote on Saturday, if we could get together on it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We can avoid the difficulty by agreeing to vote on Friday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I doubt very much whether we would save any time by having night sessions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have very grave doubts about it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Washington must realize that if we can not get together on something within reason, the whole situation is going to get very confusing. Nominations may be held up, confirmations held up, and an extra session may be brought on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the possibilities.

Mr. HARRISON. There are great possibilities, and we made a very fair proposition that debate on this bill shall stop on Monday. It was suggested by some one on the other side that the debate should stop on Saturday, and we agreed to that. Now, we are holding out on a difference of one day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; and I certainly think the Senator should not do it.

Mr. HARRISON. I may not insist on it, but some other Senator will, and there you are.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope they will not. I can not agree to vote later than Friday. I would like to get a vote at 4 o'clock on Friday, or agree that we shall take all the time we want on Friday, so that we will have an abundance of time to consider the bill and amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I do not care to press the matter if the Senator has made up his mind about it, but I was going to say that we were about at the close of the day on Tuesday—

Mr. JONES of Washington. We can run longer if we desire.

Mr. FLETCHER. We can run longer, and we can, of course, hold night sessions, if the majority insist on it. With reference to that, I am going to say that it is rather a serious

proposal in my judgment, because with the town full of grippe and influenza, I am not going to endanger my life or jeopardize my health by attending night sessions of the Senate.

I do not know how others may feel with reference to the situation, but I feel very strongly that the mortality among Senators is great already, and, if we begin holding night sessions, there will be fewer of us here at the end of the Congress than there are to-day. It is really quite a serious matter. I do not think we ought to resort to that course at all. I believe it would take a great many Assistant Sergeant at Arms to bring Senators here for night sessions so as to be able to transact much business. Then there are various publications on the ship subsidy question that it will take a great deal of time to read. I doubt if we would save any time by resorting to night sessions.

I think the Senator from Washington ought to accept the proposition that is made as a compromise, because I thought at first Monday was the earliest time we could agree upon, but I find Senators are willing to concede the point and make it Saturday.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I agree with reference to the seriousness of night sessions. I do not want to have the Senate hold night sessions. I hope we can avoid it. I am willing now to make an attempt to agree on any time Friday, at any hour of the day up until 12 o'clock at night, if Senators think they ought to have that much time to consider the measure. It is an important measure. No doubt important amendments will be offered to it, and those amendments ought to have consideration. I want to have them given consideration, and I am willing to give all the time necessary to have them properly considered. In order to do that I am willing to remain in session to-day as long as Senators may desire, and give ample time to-morrow, also.

I hope Senators will agree to a conclusion of the debate on the bill. I ask leave to modify the request so to provide that debate shall be concluded on the bill not later than 5 o'clock Friday. That proposal is subject to any change Senators may desire to present.

Mr. FLETCHER. Would the Senator accept the suggestion that general debate on the bill shall close at 5 o'clock Friday and that debate on the amendments shall be limited to 5 minutes thereafter?

Mr. JONES of Washington. To be concluded on Friday?

Mr. KING. That is for the Senate to determine.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I can not consent to carrying the bill over Friday. I am perfectly willing to close debate any time on Friday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us go on with the debate. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I believe there is already an order entered for a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow when the Senate concludes its business to-day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That order has been made.

Mr. HARRISON. How long does the Senator from Wisconsin expect to proceed this afternoon?

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to complete the formal amendments, anyway.

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate take a recess, and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] and vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (after having voted in the negative). I notice that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has not voted. Therefore I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GLASS. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is absent on account of illness.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] are absent on account of illness.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] is absent on official business. He stands paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD];

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—18.

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Glass | La Follette | Swanson |
| Brookhart | McKellar | Trammell | |
| Fletcher | Harris | Norris | Walsh, Mass. |
| George | Harrison | Shields | |
| Gerry | King | Smith | |
| | Ladd | | |

NAYS—34.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Ball | Hale | McNary | Spencer |
| Bursum | Johnson | Nelson | Stanfield |
| Calder | Jones, Wash. | New | Sterling |
| Capper | Kellogg | Norbeck | Sutherland |
| Colt | Leafoot | Oddie | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | Lodge | Philips | Warren |
| Ernst | McCormick | Polindexter | Watson |
| Fernald | McCumber | Reed, Pa. | |
| Gooding | McLean | Shortridge | |

NOT VOTING—44.

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Bayard | Edge | Moses | Robinson |
| Borah | Elkins | Myers | Sheppard |
| Brandeggee | France | Nicholson | Simmons |
| Broussard | Frelinghuysen | Overman | Smoot |
| Cameron | Harreld | Owen | Stanley |
| Caraway | Heffin | Page | Townsend |
| Couzens | Hitchcock | Pepper | Underwood |
| Culberson | Jones, N. Mex. | Pittman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Cummins | Kendrick | Pomerene | Weller |
| Dial | Keyes | Ransdell | Williams |
| Dillingham | McKinley | Reed, Mo. | Willis |

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the amendment striking out lines 19 and 20, on page 13, agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. And the amendment to strike out and insert was agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. LENROOT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 17, after line 18, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Any Federal reserve bank may also buy and sell debentures and other such obligations issued by a Federal land bank under Title II of the Federal farm loan act, but only to the same extent as and subject to the same limitation as those upon which it may buy and sell bonds issued under Title I of said act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 17, at the beginning of line 20, I move to strike out the word "cooperating" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "cooperative." That amendment is merely to correct a misprint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 18, at the end of line 12, I move to insert the word "for."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 18, at the end of line 12, after the word "eligible," it is proposed to insert the word "for"; so that it will read:

Any other class of paper of such associations which is now eligible for rediscout.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, there is one other amendment about which I have not consulted the chairman of the committee, but I am sure he will not object to it. On page 12, line 4, after the word "shall," I move to insert the words "be deemed and be held to be instrumentalities of the Government and shall."

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to state just what the effect of that amendment, if agreed to, will be?

Mr. LENROOT. That is the language of the present farm loan act with reference to farm loan bonds and farm land banks. I was just a little afraid that without that recital the constitutional question might arise. That is avoided in the present farm loan act by reason of those words being inserted, and I wish the same words to apply to this recital of fact, as well as to the other. The amendment is proposed merely to avoid any constitutional question.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is designed to make that rule apply to the debentures to be issued under this proposed act?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is a very good amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Those are all the amendments, I think, Mr. President, which I now wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LENROOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 31, 1923, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 29), 1923.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 4.

The following-named persons to be secretaries of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America:

Gustave Pabst, jr., of Wisconsin.

Rees H. Barkalow, of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles L. McKeehan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge, eastern district of Pennsylvania. (An additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 29), 1923.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Robert Woods Bliss to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

J. Butler Wright to be Third Assistant Secretary of State.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Philip Elting, of Kingston, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Agnes M. Ward, Bennett.

Gerald H. Denio, Eaton.

Frank D. Aldridge, Wellington.

DELAWARE.

LeRoy W. Hickman, Wilmington.

IDAHO.

George F. Gleed, Bonners Ferry.

Avery G. Constant, Buhl.

Hazel Vickrey, Firth.

Samuel P. Oldham, Rexburg.

Haly C. Kunter, Ririe.

ILLINOIS.

Harry R. Morgan, Aledo.

A. Luella Smith, Chatham.

Harry S. Farmer, Farmer City.

Charles J. Douglas, Gilman.

Peter H. Conzet, Greenup.

John A. Dausmann, Lebanon.

Margaret Heider, Minonk.

Benjamin S. Price, Mount Morris.

John Lawrence, jr., O'Fallon.

William F. Hemenway, Sycamore.

INDIANA.

Frank Lyon, Arcadia.

Louis M. Biesecker, Cedar Lake.

Burr E. York, Converse.

Iiah M. Dausman, Goshen.

Hattie M. Craw, Jonesboro.

John M. Johnston, Loganport.

Ralph W. Gaylor, Mishawaka.

Vernon D. Macy, Mooresville.

Henry D. Long, New Harmony.

George E. Jones, Peru.

Ernest A. Bodey, Rising Sun.

Orville B. Kilmer, Warsaw.

IOWA.

Daniel H. Eyler, Clarion.

Henry H. Gilbertson, Lansing.

Charlie M. Willard, Persia.

Spencer C. Nelson, Tama.

Carl Wulkau, Williams.

MAINE.

Ralph T. Horton, Calais.

Michael J. Kennedy, Woodland.

MICHIGAN.

Herbert E. Ward, Bangor.

James W. Cobb, Birmingham.

George H. Neisler, Dearborn.

Ernest A. Densmore, Mason.

Ira J. Stephens, Mendon.

Charles J. Kappler, Port Austin.

Dorr A. Rosencrans, Reed City.

Charles H. Dodge, Romeo.

Charles A. Jordan, Saline.

Homer L. Allard, Sturgis.

MONTANA.

John M. Bever, Bridger.

Arthur C. Baker, Hamilton.

Estella K. Smith, Lima.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Harlie A. Cole, Groveton.

Fred W. Smith, North Woodstock.

James R. Kill Kelley, Wilton.

NEW JERSEY.

Annie E. Hoffman, Allenhurst.

Frederick Knapp, Little Ferry.

Joseph R. Forrest, Palisades Park.

Wilbur Fuller, Sussex.

NEW YORK.

James G. Lewis, Naples.

OKLAHOMA.

Forrest L. Strong, Clinton.
Perry E. High, Maysville.
Elmer D. Rook, Sayre.

OREGON.

Cyril G. Shaw, Kerry.
Henry H. McReynolds, Pilot Rock.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Edward A. P. Christley, Ellwood City.

TENNESSEE.

Simon C. Dodson, Sparta.
Michel K. Freeman, Westmoreland.

UTAH.

John A. Call, Bountiful.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 30, 1923.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we are not alone with Thee. He who considers the lily and notes the sparrow's fall has said to all men, "Come unto me." Bestow upon us this day the blessings of a free mind and an untroubled heart. Help us to forgive our enemies, to encourage the ignorant, to relieve the distressed, and to share with others the common fruits of toil. We thank Thee for the freedom of government and for the blessings that hallow the paths of our citizenship. Bless all educational, charitable, and religious institutions; may they go on unimpaired to higher usefulness. May every day bring to us, to our homes, and to our whole land the fragrant flowers of love, joy, patience, and good will. Through Christ, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report (H. Rept. 1477) and accompanying statement on the legislative appropriation bill for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents the conference report and accompanying statement on the legislative appropriation bill for printing under the rule. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4358. An act to authorize the American Niagara Railroad Corporation to build a bridge across the Niagara River between the State of New York and the Dominion of Canada;

S. 4387. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Tugaloo River between South Carolina and Georgia; and

S. 4398. An act in recognition of the valor of the officers and men of the Seventy-ninth Division who were killed in action or died of wounds received in action.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13926) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1690) to correct the military record of John Sullivan.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 31, and 35 to the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had receded from its amendment numbered 34 to said bill. That the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the

House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to said bill, had further insisted upon its said amendment, had requested a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. SMITH as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 422.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PHILANDER C. KNOX, late a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 423.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BOIES PENROSE, late a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 424.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM E. CROW, late a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 425.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Hon. SHERMAN E. BURROUGHS, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

And that the Vice President, under the second resolution, had appointed Mr. MOSES, Mr. KEYES, Mr. HARRELD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BAYARD, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

COLORADO RIVER PACT.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing in 8-point type some information that I have gathered relative to the Colorado River compact.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Are they the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are partly my own remarks, but otherwise they are questions and answers relative to the pact, addressed to Mr. Hoover, chairman of the commission, and Mr. Davis, Chief Engineer, and others. The data that I have gathered, I am sure, will be of interest to the House as well as to the people of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River compact is of immediate and intense interest to the people of the seven States of the basin of that mighty river, and the Nation as a whole will soon realize its importance. This is the first time that so large a number of States have sought a unanimous agreement upon a question which vitally affects their common welfare. Very naturally there has been a desire to secure all the information that could possibly be obtained not only as to